

THE  
**Eclectic Review.**

AUGUST, 1852.

ART. I.—6. *A Letter on the Cultivation of Cotton, the Extension of internal Communication and other Matters connected with India, addressed to Sir Harry Verney, M.P.* By Edward Money, of the 25th Regiment of Bengal Native Infantry. London: James Ridgway.

7. *Parliamentary Paper*, 622. Aug. 1, 1851. *East India Public Works, India.*

It was not considered necessary in our former notice of this important subject to give any elaborate proof of the deficiency of roads in India, and the miserable character of such as there are. The testimony of Mr. Money (art. 6, above) is, however, so pertinent and decisive, that it would be a grave omission not to quote it, premising, that whilst he admits the deplorable want of roads in India, he is an eulogist of the Indian Government, and evinces some portion of that *esprit du corps*, which attaches to the members of all corporate or administrative bodies. Mr. Money's competency as a witness rests on the fact that he 'resided in India for a number of years, and was employed on the public works, both military and civil; during a part of which time he was located in one of the great cotton districts, and on one of the great cotton thoroughfares, of which he was in charge.' The following is his testimony:—  
'That India is destitute of roads, no one who has studied the maps, with the power of testing their accuracy, and knows what interminable difficulties present themselves in the way of wheel carriages, or who has seen the manner in which the merchan-

dize or produce of one district is, perforce, transported to another, or who has seen grain at a famine price in one spot and in abundance at another a hundred miles distant, CAN DOUBT FOR ONE MINUTE; . . . or that the want of good roads is the great evil of our Indian administration, and is that for which the East India Company will have most difficulty to find an excuse when the renewal of the Charter comes under discussion.'—pp. 31, 32.

Mr. Money states further, (p. 34,) that 'until roads are constructed in India, all improvements, whether it be in the cotton or other cultivation, or in the education and civilization of the natives, must be retarded.' It will scarcely be believed, that in the Bengal presidency, comprising 360,000 square miles, nearly five times the area of Great Britain, the length of roads (not exceeding in any case forty feet wide) 'on which a four-in-hand could be driven fifty miles on end without let or hindrance,' is not 1500 miles; whilst in England and Wales only, in 1829, there were turnpike roads to the extent of 20,875, to say nothing of 80,000 miles of bye-roads, all passable for carriages.

Turning to other testimony (art. 6, above), and confining quotation to the expenditure on public works in the Bombay presidency, that being the one from which an augmented supply of cotton must principally, if at all, be obtained, the following is a condensed abstract of the 'EXPENDITURE on the construction and repair of PUBLIC WORKS, in the ROAD and TANK DEPARTMENT, from the 1st of May, 1836, to the 30th of April, 1847:—

	£.		£.
Repairs of roads in 10 years . . . .	200,774	per ann.	20,077
Construction of new roads, do. . . .	105,454	"	10,445
Repairs of old bridges, do. . . . .	6,068	"	606
Construction of new bridges, do. . . .	23,377	"	2,339
Repairs—old tanks, do. . . . .	43,840	"	4,384
Construction of new tanks, do. . . . .	20,740	"	2,074
<b>Total.—Repairs in 10 years . . . . .</b>	<b>250,682</b>	<b>"</b>	<b>25,068</b>
<b>New constructions, do. . . . .</b>	<b>148,591</b>	<b>"</b>	<b>14,859</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>399,273</b>		<b>39,927</b>

The area of the presidency being 65,000 square miles, and its revenue about £2,500,000 per annum, it follows that the expenditure on *all* these objects has been at the rate of 12s. 3d. per square mile annually, and has constituted a charge of 3½d. in the pound on the annual revenue. Miserable as is this result, it is not the worst to be deduced from the significant figures quoted. The whole expenditure in the ten years on



new roads, at £800 per mile, would give 130 miles, including bridges, or thirteen miles per annum: whilst in England and Wales, in the eleven years from 1818 to 1829, 1000 miles of turnpike road were constructed at a cost incomparably greater than £800 per mile! Extending the comparison from the Bombay presidency to the whole of British India, it appears that in the fourteen years, from 1834 to 1848, the whole expenditure of the Indian government on roads, bridges, and tanks, was £1,434,000, *less by £140,000 than the expenditure for the single year 1841, on the repairs only of the 20,000 miles of turnpike roads in England and Wales, which was £1,574,000.* It would be an almost sinful waste of words to adduce another proof, that "AS A SYSTEM, ROADS HAVE NO EXISTENCE IN INDIA!"

Sir James Hogg may, however, be commended to Mr. Money's pamphlet, and the Parliamentary Return which shows the construction of thirteen miles of new roads annually over a surface of 65,000 square miles, to correct that poetic tendency which was so wonderfully displayed in his speech of June 18, 1850, on Mr. Bright's motion; and more especially in his quotation of Mr. Bell's evidence, relative to Candeish, that 'the intersection of the roads is the first thing which strikes a stranger!' Sir James Hogg, and his compeers in the East India Directory, may rest assured, that neither alleged facts, argument, nor oratory, will remove, in one iota, the belief, amongst all who understand the matter, that roads are vitally essential to the prosperity of India, and that some body or bodies shall be made responsible for their construction.

The question of immediate and indispensable urgency to answer is, then, simply this—Who, in India, is responsible to make the roads? Clearly, we think, the Hon. Company itself. THE COMPANY IS PROPRIETOR OF THE SOIL. All its acts proceed on this assumption. In virtue of proprietorship, rents are fixed, annually, or otherwise, by the Company. Rent or land-tax is the principal source of revenue. The government either takes as rent all that the cultivator or Zemindar can afford to pay after providing for roads, or it does not. If the former is the rule, clear and distinct regulations should be in existence for the construction and maintenance of roads on some municipal or district system. If the latter be the rule, then the government alone is responsible, and must be judged by its deeds. There is little, if any dispute, that the actual system belongs to the second category; and it follows that, waiving all censure on account of past omissions, a present and most onerous obligation rests upon the government of India. The capability of that vast country to produce a large supply of cotton, is not

doubted by any competent judge ; but difficulties in the way of transit render unavailable that capability, not simply as they enhance the price and deteriorate the quality of the cotton produced ; but as they offer almost insuperable obstacles in the way of direct European agency and capital, directed to the staple, the better picking, sorting, and packing of the cotton, and the emancipation of the cultivator from his present situation of serfdom to the village banker and other classes of middlemen, who, together with the government, leave him little else than labour-wages for all his toil.

But it is objected that the government of India is in debt, and that on the average of the last four or five years the expenditure has exceeded the income ; and so a government is neither to see to it that municipal provision is made for the construction of roads, nor to do the work itself, because its income is not sufficient. No such defence can for a moment be tolerated. It supposes that a government can dispense with the performance of some of its first duties, involving the essential conditions of national well-being, on the score of poverty ; just as a man may dispense with superfluities and luxuries in the hour of reverse and loss. There are certain things a government *must* do, or forfeit its right to govern ; and in the present condition of India as to roads, the competency of any government for the onerous rule over that vast territory must be tested amongst other things, by what it does to facilitate exchange and production. It is sheer sophistry to urge that what is asked is in violation of the principle of free trade. All that is asked of the government is, that it shall provide all those social and material conditions which lie directly in its province—not that it shall provide and apply capital or labour directly in production. A government must do one of two things, as to roads—either provide them out of the general revenue, or make provision obligatory on municipalities or district to do so. At the low cost at which roads may be constructed in India, according to some authorities, £800 per mile, *but according to Mr. Money, £450*, there is no excuse for their absence. As an investment they would pay ; for it is well known that, wherever they have been found, the increased interchange has augmented the customs' duties in a more than proportionate degree, quite apart from the tolls collected.

What has been done in the neighbouring island of Ceylon under the enlightened administration of Sir Emerson Tennent, amply illustrates this view of the matter. In this island, with a revenue not one-fifth of that of Bombay, 1247 miles of road were rendered serviceable in four and a half years ; and the follow-



ing are some of the results :—‘ Before the Candy road was made, the paddy fields at Kaduganame were but worth one-half what they now sell for. Before the road was made to Anarajapoor, the people could not sell their rice for more than 6*d.* or 7*d.* a parrah; and they could scarcely get fish or salt to buy at any price, *because the dealers could neither come to sell their fish nor to buy their rice*; now they get from 2*s.* 6*d.* to 3*s.* a parrah for all rice they can grow; and they get their salt, and fish, and every other article, abundant and cheap, *so that the effect of new roads is to double the value of land, to double the value of every thing you have to sell, and to lower the cost of everything you have to buy.*’ The philosophy of these changes is simple enough. Exchange was rendered practicable betwixt those who could produce salt and fish and those who could grow rice, and their mutual interests and necessities led to increased production and traffic. Land became more productive, and paid a correspondingly higher rent; the cost of carriage being reduced, the grower of rice could command a higher price at the place of production, *equivalent to that reduction*—the price at the remoter places of production being governed by the price in the immediate vicinage of the places of consumption and export; and for the same reason all articles of coast produce could be sold in the remoter provinces at a price less by the reduction of carriage—the first price of such commodities being determined by competition *at the coast*.

In any arrangement which may be made betwixt the supreme legislature of this country and the East India Company, there will be a culpable neglect of duty on the part of the legislature on the one hand, and of the several parties on the other, who are interested in the most perfect and speedy development of the resources of India; unless distinct and efficient regulations are secured, touching the construction and maintenance of roads. A revenue of twenty-five millions sterling, out of which four or five millions is annually transmitted to Great Britain as rental or tribute-money, call it which you will, and out of which £140,000 or £150,000 only is annually expended on roads, for the benefit of those who pay the tribute, involves all who administer it in deep responsibility; and patent as the fact is now made, will not long be suffered to offend the national sense of propriety and justice by its continuance.

By whatever mode the want of common roads in India may ultimately be supplied, most strongly is any government or municipal action to be deprecated in the construction and management of railways. It may be said, if common roads may be entrusted to municipalities or governments, why not



railways? The obvious answer as respects municipalities or parishes is, that as to common roads, the most minute subdivision of responsibility as to their construction and management does not *necessarily* prevent their serving the proposed end. It may, indeed, happen, as in fact it does, that some portions of a great trunk road are very good, and others execrable, but the road is open and practicable nevertheless. In the case of a railway—whether of 30 or 300 miles—it is a machine to all intents and purposes only to be wrought effectually under *one* management—nay, the unity of system must extend, as practically it does in England, over the entire of a kingdom! The safety and efficiency of each line of railway depends on the coherence of its whole arrangements with the arrangements of all other lines. For all practical purposes the railways of England are *one* vast machine, deriving motion from a central and common source of power. It is obvious that the only issue open, as to the proper source of control and management is, whether government or public companies are most fit. The abstract question is discussed with considerable acuteness by Mr. Chapman in the 9th chapter of his valuable book, pages 327 and 362. The argument will not bear compression within the needful limit of this article; but there are two short passages, so pithy, pointed, and forcible, that quotation is only a just acknowledgment of their merit. Replying to the proposal of a ‘government department for railways,’ suggested by those who feel that there is great force in the objection against the administration of them by the ordinary executive bodies, he says,—

‘If such a department be under the effective control of the heads of the government, it must partake of all the delays and incertitude of government action; nor does it seem possible that the most gigantic and unwearied intellect, occupied imperatively with the multifarious concerns of government, should preserve continuity of recollection and permanence of purpose enough to dictate with effect even the general measures to be taken in the various stages of industrial affairs. If, on the other hand, the department be not so effectually controlled, the whole amounts to nothing more than giving the name, weight, and authority of government to men who, with less than the ordinary inducement to acquire qualifications, or make efforts, are placed exactly in a position to have everything their own way. It is in these bye-nooks of organization, where some extraneous object is hung on to the great legitimate business of the political system, that official incompetence or indifference is most likely to nestle itself; and where it snugly holds in defiance that responsibility which can only reach it by first tearing away the much-abused screen of “the government.”’

To this inaptitude of government and government bonds for the management of industrial enterprises he opposes the

following contrast descriptive of private enterprise :—‘The energy of single character, in which, unshorn, lies its strength—the wary alacrity with which its objects are pursued and its opportunities seized—its freedom and care in selecting and changing its agents—its exemption from trammels imposed by other duties and relations—its less wide-spread risks of extraneous obstruction—its simplicity of purpose and unity of plan—the caution with which each of its minor operations is made to fall into system with all the rest, and its deep-felt interest in the result, give it a character altogether different from that of a government management of the like affairs, and leave it to be regretted that no mode of association has yet been devised by which the great undertakings of our age can be made to participate more in its advantage.’

It is difficult to add to the force of this reasoning, but the subject demands further amplification.

Two railways are now in course of construction in India,—the EAST INDIA RAILWAY, and the EAST INDIA PENINSULAR RAILWAY. The first is to form part of a line of communication from Calcutta to the upper provinces of India; the second commences at Bombay, and proceeds to the Ghauts by way of Callian. Both railways are to be constructed by companies, finding a specific capital on which a profit of five per cent. per annum is guaranteed by the East India Company for ninety-nine years, *the land being provided by the East India Company*. The whole outlay already thus guaranteed is £2,000,000, about five per cent. of the sum sunk in British railways in some five or six years!

Whilst the fact that railways *are* commenced in India is to be rejoiced at, the fact that government control in the shape of a guarantee is involved in that commencement, is to be deeply regretted. Wherever there has been a fair mercantile prospect of advantage British capital has ever been found ready for investment. To mix up the certainty of a profit under any possible issue of an adventure is to neutralize the motives for caution and foresight which are most strongly wrought upon, when men feel that all depends on their own good management. Besides, a party guaranteeing is likely to be an interfering party—it has a right so to do—and will not be slow to exercise it. The history of the East India Company is pregnant with meaning as to any connexion to be allowed betwixt it and any undertakings of a purely industrial character. Trade with India and China languished so long as the Company alone had the control of it—was, in fact, the only channel of exchange. How that trade has increased since it was thrown open is matter of notoriety. But a guarantee to a railway company is

a resumption, to a limited extent, indeed, of the trading character of the Company—a mixing up of uncommingable things—defence of rights, and the administration of affairs purely and necessarily imperial, with matters of individual action, effort, and enterprise. In what manner the action of the government of India will show itself as respects the railways in question is matter of speculation. That its action will be felt is an absolute certainty. It may, to use the words of Mr. Chapman, ‘bring into the affairs of the railways the procrastinating complexity and stifling formality of all government proceedings,—it may substitute official supervision for the solicitude of ownership,—it may endanger the reputation of government for impartiality amongst the interests it ought to protect, and over which it ought to adjudicate alike’—and if so, no prophet is needed to tell us that its connexion with such undertakings will be an unmixed evil. The true course for all parties concerned is for the undertakers of such companies to *help themselves*, and to leave the government to its ‘sole functions in all such matters—that of a judge and protector of rights.’

The whole theory, in fact, of government action, either in whole or part, in any matter, out of its own specific province, as the conservator of interests purely national and the judge in questions of individual rights, stands opposed to the whole economy out of which has issued the present commercial manufacturing and social elevation of the British people; it is the antagonistic idea to that of the division of labour; and in whatever form it manifests itself, whether in respect to the assumption of railway property as was once proposed in England, in the over-riding control of central boards, poor law, sanitary, or what not, or in the management and direction of the education of the people, its action ought to be resisted.

On the subject of roads and railways in India, it only remains further to add, that Mr. Chapman’s book is full of details as to the eligibility of particular routes, and ought to be diligently read by all who intend to invest in East India lines; and let it be added, that as it will only be by British capital that any great extension of the system will be carried out in India, it concerns all who are anxiously looking to that vast country for a larger supply of cotton, thoroughly to master the considerations which show the superior eligibility of one or other of the projects for the extension of the line in the Bombay presidency, beyond its present terminus at Callian; and for impartiality’s sake, let them read Colonel Grant’s work as well as Mr. Chapman’s.

The incidence of the land tax is the vexed question betwixt the members and subordinates of the East India Company on



the one hand, and the Manchester spinners on the other. By the former it is contended that the land tax is, in fact, rent, and not tax, and therefore, if remitted altogether by the government, it would either be received by somebody else; or, if the ownership of the soil reverted to the present occupier, in consequence of the surrender of the tax by the government, no more cotton would be grown than at present, because other produce pays better. These persons further maintain that the assessment of the tax is conducted with so much care, and with such scrupulous regard to the interests of the cultivator or Ryot, that he is in no degree worse off because of the tax than he would be if the ownership of the soil were in a body of resident landowners, as in England, the rent being adjusted, as in England, by two free and independent parties—the landlord and the tenant. The civil servants of the Honourable Company, as might have been guessed beforehand, in the evidence before the committee of 1848, drew a very flattering picture of the paternal care of the governor and council of India in relation to this matter of the land-tax, and of the strict regard paid by the collectors to their instructions. True, the rule of the East India Company is a despotism; but, as the Iron Duke said, it is a ‘mild despotism,’ and according to the collectors of the land tax, it is a most kind, paternal, and just one. How far these abstract opinions are correct, and the alleged leniency and mildness of the Honourable Company’s revenue administration are sustained by stern facts, will best be decided by describing the machinery of the system. Preliminarily, however, it is necessary to explain from what sources the revenue of India is derived, and the several methods of assessing and collecting the land tax.

The sources of Indian revenue are six—1. Land Tax; 2. The Salt Monopoly; 3. The Opium Monopoly; 4. Stamps; 5. Post Office; 6. Abkary, or Tax on Spirits. Of these, the first produces about three-fourths of the entire revenue, and the salt and opium monopolies probably an equal proportion of the remaining fourth. The land tax is, then, the great source of revenue. Up to a recent period, other taxes, such as transit dues, taxes on implements, &c., were in existence, and were most annoying and mischievous; but these have wisely been abolished in the greater portion of the presidencies, if not altogether; for there is some confusion in the evidence on this point. The land tax is an ancient tax, to which the people of India are accustomed, and to which they submit as a necessity of state and a matter of course, though they are made to feel from time to time—as are all tax-payers—that it may be made as oppressive as it is regular and customary. There are certain

exemptions from it, arising out of grants from successive sovereigns, either as the rewards of military service or of political subserviency, or even treachery, the existence of which has led to immense litigation betwixt the East India Company and the present proprietors; and, according to some well-informed writers on Indian affairs, to much practical injustice in the *resumption* of such rent-free properties on the *pretence* of insufficient title on the part of the possessors; but in reality, under the promptings of a greedy desire for revenue. Nor is the struggle betwixt these hereditary owners of portions of the soil and the government of India ended; for a recent writer advocates a wholesale system of resumption, which would disturb millions almost of individual tenures, if it did not convulse society in India. That subject is, however, foreign to the immediate object of this article, and must be dismissed with this allusion to it.

There are three principal modes of assessing the land-tax, namely—1. The permanent assessment; 2. The settlement for long periods, varying from twenty to thirty years; and, 3. The Ryot-warry system, which, in other words, means an annual assessment.

The permanent settlement originated with Lord Cornwallis, in 1793, and extends throughout Bengal, Bahar, Benares, and Orissa. The principle of this settlement was, simply, that an average of the rents which had been paid for ten years should be established as a perpetual rental, the government giving to the Zemindars, or large landowners, the right to their lands in perpetuity, subject to the rental established, as before shown. Of course, the Zemindars underlet, just as the landed proprietors of England do, for the best rents they can get; and it is stated, that the present rental of the Zemindaries is equal to double the quit rent paid by them to the government. Be that as it may, and waving inquiry whether the government, being proprietor of the soil, acted wisely in alienating the ownership, subject only to a perpetual fixed rent, certain it is, that the *settled districts*, as they are called, have been just those in which European enterprise and capital have been most extensively employed. The portions of India under the long-lease settlement are the north-western provinces of the Bengal presidency, the sub-presidency of Agra, or the north-west presidency, as it is sometimes called, and portions of the Bombay presidency. In the first two portions of India, the settlement is for thirty years; and in such parts of the Bombay presidency as have been settled the lease is for twenty years, but with this peculiarity in the arrangement, 'that a rental is fixed on each field, payable only if the field is cultivated.'

General opinion sanctions the long-lease settlement as the

best arrangement to encourage improved culture, and the most just to all parties. In the north-western presidency the settlement is a very recent one, and appears to have been made with great care and after minute inquiry. In the Bombay presidency, the same system is in course of introduction; but the Ryot-warry system still prevails over a large portion of that presidency, and altogether in that of Madras.

For the purposes of assessment and collection of revenue, the provinces, under the Ryot-warry system, are divided into collectorates, over which a principal collector, whose office is a very important one, presides, and who is, besides, a magistrate, invested with large powers to carry out his decisions. Theoretically, it is assumed that the head collector annually visits the several parishes, or *villages*, as they are called in India, for the purpose of determining, according to the extent of land under cultivation and the prospects of the crop, the amount of land-tax to be paid. Practically, the head collector visits only a small section of his collectorate, the work of assessment being conducted by sub-collectors and their assistants. For the purposes of this subdivision of labour, each province is divided into counties or *talooks*, over which a native officer with a suitable staff presides, and who is charged with the management of the police and revenue of his county. In Madras, this officer is designated a *tassildar*, and his functions are very onerous and important. As respects the land-tax, he is in reality a land agent, whose business it is to survey and assess the several parishes within his county, and to correspond with the head collector. On the other hand, he also puts himself in communication with the *pattels*, or head men of the village, and the village accountant; both formerly hereditary officers and independent of the government, but now paid servants of the East India Company.

At the proper period for determining the amount of the annual tax, the collector or his representative visits the villages in succession, and having pitched his tent, calls before him the *pattel* and the village accountant, and invites the cultivators also, to come and state their objections, if any, to the assessment which he determines, after hearing the report of the proper officers, and referring for correction to the records of past assessments, as shown by the village books. The whole proceeding is, in fact, a rent-audit, in which the village collectively, as a body of tenants, or the individual cultivator, seeks to obtain the lowest terms from their landlord—the Honourable Company; and for this purpose they represent, as English tenants would in like circumstances, all the unfavourable symptoms and circumstances of the growing crop, as, on the other hand,



the collector is sure to urge the *per contra* view of the case. In most cases the head cultivators, after the assessment is finally agreed upon, become responsible for the assessment of the entire village, and agree amongst the whole body of cultivators on the individual amount to be paid. The collector has power to prevent the removal of the crops until the instalments of land-tax are paid—a power which frequently prevents the crop being reaped, and thereby causes its destruction on the ground. He has also power to remit balances or arrears of land-tax; and there is abundant evidence that this has frequently been done, clearly proving that the assessment had been too high.

Such being the system of the annual assessment and collection of the land-tax, its wisdom and policy may be judged of in two ways: 1. By the law of probability, founded on the working of analogous institutions; and 2. By the actual results, in the condition of the cultivators, or Ryots. By either, or both methods, we conceive, it must stand condemned, as a most clumsy and injurious system.

A hasty analogy would suggest, that the relation of the Ryot to the East India Company, under the system of annual assessment, is nearly identical with that of an English tenant-at-will to his landlord. No more false analogy can be imagined. The only semblance of agreement is, that the rent is fixed *only for one year*. The points of dissimilarity are many and striking. The rental in India is determined on an annual survey and valuation of the crops; and is, in fact, an annual adjustment of the rent or tax; the rent in England, on a tenant-at-will farm, is *practically* determined by a free contract betwixt landlord and tenant, each party having a thorough knowledge of the average prices and produce of the land for years back, the tenant being governed in taking the farm by the prospect of a fair remuneration for his capital, and the probability of a prolonged holding of his land at the rent agreed upon. There is uncertainty, more or less harassing, in the former case, just according to the fairness and judgment of the collector and his subordinates; in the latter case, there is certainty, both as to amount of rent and continuance of tenure, only short, in a great majority of cases, of a lease for a term of years. In England, the arrangement is practically made with the owner of the land, who knows all about its capabilities, and in the main has no interest in rack-renting it, but the contrary. In India, the tenant, if he may be called such, makes his arrangement with the landlord only through a host of subordinates, who may, and probably have, an interest in making the most of their county or collectorate, and in standing well with the

revenue department. In point of fact, the rental of a tenant-at-will in England cannot be altered without his consent, and after free bargain, whilst the rental of the Indian cultivator is absolutely at the decision of the collector or his subordinates; for although he is bound to hear all that the cultivators wish to urge, his power is absolute, and absolute power may rest in a man who is disposed to regard the Ryots as prone to over-reach, or is wrong-headed and overweening in the conceit of his own judgment, or is anxious to make a large return, and who, therefore, will always lean to the side of over-assessment. And last of all, the English tenant-at-will belongs to a class that will not continuously cling to the land, except as it affords the average profit of capital, for although the man who has once acquired the status and habits of a farmer rarely quits his occupation, a permanent diminution of the profits of farming below the general rate of mercantile profit, would drive his sons to one or other of the thousand channels of employment which are open to them in the national manufactures and commerce—a resort, in point of fact, which is extensively adopted by that class throughout the entire agricultural districts of great Britain—a fact well known on many an exchange, and in every large manufacturing town. But the Ryot has no alternative. He is either a cultivator of the soil, or nothing. Trade and commerce are shut to him: they are only open to the few rich natives, who have for generations, perhaps, been engaged in them. The very carrying trade is in the hands of a particular caste of the people, and so are the various artizan crafts. To argue then, as some of the witnesses before Mr. Bright's committee did, that the land-tax of India is analogous to the rent of land in this country, and still more to maintain, as Dr. Royle does, that the system meets those conditions of national taxation which Mr. Mill defines as least interfering with the development of national resources, and realizing a sufficient revenue with the least possible deduction for the expenses of collection, is simply absurd; because there is no analogy, not even a remote one, betwixt the two cases. In fact, the question as to the land-tax is mystified by any reference to the theory of rent as existing in England. It will be time enough to draw parallelisms when other and equal channels of employment for capital and labour exist in India besides that of the cultivation of the soil,—when that cultivation has arrived at the stage of requiring considerable capital in the cultivator,—and therefore constituting him an independent party in the bargain—when the ownership of land shall become matter of purchase and sale, and rent measure, as it does here, the



difference betwixt the value of the produce of the soil and the fair profit of capital, after defraying all the expenses of cultivation.

There is, then, as it seems to us, no ground whatever for placing the land-tax of India and the rents of land in England in the same category as identical things. Yet it is on the alleged identity of the two things that the bold assertion has been hazarded, that the land-tax does not interfere with the production of cotton in India; always, however, remembering that this allegation is coupled with another—namely, that other crops pay better than cotton, and *therefore* land-tax is no land-tax—the cultivation of cotton will be the same. The second allegation will cease to have force the moment the cost of transit is reduced, and the consequent deterioration of the staple is obviated by the formation of good roads or railways. Even supposing that the cotton is in no respect improved in staple or cleanness, cheaper carriage to the coasts will make up all the difference in the comparative profitableness of cultivating cotton and articles of food. Assuming that—then, if it can be shown that even on the admission that the land-tax is simply rent, it operates injuriously on the cultivation, because of the mode and manner of its assessment and collection, the whole argument in its defence falls to the ground.

An attentive perusal of the evidence for and against the land-tax will establish the fact, that, on both sides, the real question has been overlooked. Mr. Brown may be right in saying the land-tax is *not* rent, or Mr. Mangles may be right in saying that it *is* rent. On either hypothesis the relation of the two parties—the land-owner and the occupier or cultivator—may be such, that improvements in cultivation and a general advance in wealth may be impossible; and such, it is believed, is the fact. That the Ryots are steeped in poverty is admitted on all hands. It matters not whether the witness be retained by the Company or by the Manchester Spinners, all the evidence in the Blue Book, 'Growth of Cotton in India,' goes to establish the fact of the deep poverty of the Ryot, and his absolute dependence on extraneous aid for carrying on his business. It is as clear as evidence can make it, that his personal remuneration is simply that of the wages of labour. His stock in trade is contemptible in amount, his living is cheap and simple, and for the very means of producing his crops he pawns them to the village banker at an extravagant rate of interest—that disinterested functionary enjoying, besides his claim for interest, the pre-emption of the crops in repayment of his advances, which, it is almost needless to add, he gets below the market price. The Ryot, in one word, is a mere labourer, cultivating, with the



capital of the village banker, the soil owned by the Honourable Company, and giving either in interest to the one, or as land-tax to the other, all the produce, save the miserable pittance on which he subsists. He *does not*, because he *can not*, accumulate capital—improved culture is, therefore, out of question, whether of cotton or anything else. The fact of his poverty being undeniable, it is clear that he either pays too much as land-tax, or that the mode of the assessment discourages all attempts at improvement. Both causes, it is believed, are in operation. It does not seem to have occurred to the Honourable Company, or their servants, that it was needful to disturb the *status quo* of Indian customs—even as respects matters of trade and production. Because the Ryot had always paid, as land-tax or rent—call it which you will—all but what would keep body and soul together, they fulfilled the obligation of rule if they kept him in the same position in which conquest handed him over to them! That such is the incidence of the land-tax is a stubborn fact. Wherever it prevails, as an annual tax, the Ryot, like the Irish cottier, is a mere serf or labourer; and he is so, because of the conditions of his tenure. The rule of assessment has palpably been to leave *him* subsistence, and to take all besides. It is idle, then, to say that the land-tax does not interfere with the production of cotton. It interferes with production generally, and therefore with cotton as well as grain and other produce. The remedy is suggested by the disease. The evil is, that saving or accumulation is impracticable, and the condition of the Ryot is the stereotyped one of vassalage and poverty. The remedy is to provide that accumulation shall be practicable, and to leave the result to the operation of the ordinary motives which induce thrift and economy. A tenure, which will secure these conditions, is that which is desiderated. Obviously and notoriously the Ryot-warry system has not secured them, nor is it consonant with fact or analogy, that an annual settlement, conducted as that is, under the Ryot-warry plan, can ever offer the inducement to enterprise and effort; that inducement always being the certainty of profit and accumulation.

The first step in the course of improvement is the substitution of a *certain* for an *uncertain* tenure of land. The extinguishment of hope is the extinguishment of effort; and when there is no expectation of beneficial results there will be no manful struggle. A system which admits of the abstraction of all but mere wages from the cultivator precludes all advance, and stereotypes the arts of life. Such is, in truth, the present condition of our Indian empire. Whether the land-tax be rent, or simply tax, is not the true question, that question being the incidence of the assessment on the energies and resources of the cultivator. It

would be difficult to devise a scheme more mischievous and depressing than that of the land-tax as an *annual* assessment. It has the two vices of uncertainty and arbitrariness, which are just the conditions of a low state of the productive arts; and experience has shown that much and almost irreparable mischief may be inflicted by the erroneous judgment of a collector. The servants of the Honourable Company, as might be expected, vouch unhesitatingly for the fairness of the assessment, and assert the extreme anxiety of the executive to deal fairly with the Ryots; but all analogy contradicts the idea that the *tax assessor* will look more to the interest of the tax payer than of the tax receiver. In fact, one notorious cause of over assessment is on record, the case of Bundelcund and Mr. Scott Waring. Our rule commenced there in 1806, and up to 1816 that rule appears to have been wise and equitable. In the latter year, Mr. Scott Waring, the collector, misled by a sudden increase in the price of cotton, raised the assessment in the western districts thirty per cent., and in the eastern districts forty-six per cent. The result was the ruin of all parties, the Zemindar and the Ryots alike. Of the total number of villages, amounting to 621, only 139 were preserved to the original landowners; of 137 villages brought to sale, no less than 61 were purchased by the government, because there were no bidders at all. In the western district, the proprietors of 178 villages threw up their lands rather than agree to the extravagant demands of the collector. So matters remained for five years; and so complete was the prostration of the province, that twenty years of just assessment has scarcely sufficed to restore the revenue to its original point.

The broad general conclusion at which we arrive is, that the annual assessment in the Madras presidency, and in parts of the Bombay, is a positive evil; and that whether it be considered to be rent or tax. Fixed tenure and fixed rents, always supposing rent to be determined in a fair bargain betwixt the landowner and the tenant, are the essential conditions of agricultural prosperity. The annual assessment in India violates these conditions, and therefore necessitates the opposite of prosperity. It would be difficult to show a condition of more abject poverty than that of the Indian Ryot—always excepting the Irish cottier—and the fact of that condition proves the virulence of its cause.

Turning from the economical question of improved roads and the incidence of the land-tax, other and graver subjects present themselves in connexion with India. Our past rule has had its basis, partly in the prestige of military skill and prowess, and partly in the general fairness and equity of our judicial and

revenue administration. The whole of Hindoostan is now directly or indirectly under our rule. Hitherto the ever-recurring spectacle of military achievement has held the people of Hindoostan in awe and subjection ; for the future, the continuance of our power will have to rest on the proved equity of our administration. The Indian government has, by its own acts, made this a condition of permanence. It has provided a complete education for the nation, quite rivalling a university education in this country. That education will bear its fruits. Minds will be awakened, and in a thousand forms will demonstrate its power ; it will be impossible to exclude native talent and native thought from its due share in the general government. Not more surely does water seek its level than does mind. In what form the cultivated mind of India will exert itself it would be rash to predict ; but assuredly the minds of 150 millions of people must have force as against the minds of some 80,000 Europeans, when the difference of intellectual status ceases to exist. Add to this the necessary results of improved roads and railways, in bringing into contact the intelligence and energy of the Saxon character with the Hindoo, and it is easy to see that new conditions are dawning upon India, the ultimate result of which can only dimly be foreshadowed. Self-government may be, as yet, a distant thing, but native participation in rule, in some form or other, must follow the development of Indian resources, physical and mental. If India is to produce cotton in any quantity commensurate to our wants, a complete revolution in all the modes of culture, of transit, and of exchange, is inevitable ; and that revolution supposes a higher form of enlightenment and civilization. India cannot rival the United States in the production of cotton, except as it approaches to it in the arts of cultivation, and the general habits of trade.

Of the capability of India to produce cotton of an improved quality, no doubt exists. The experiments of the East India Company have set that question at rest. It is clear that in certain soils the yield is more abundant, and the quality superior, from American seed. It is a question of time and profit, which, with improved modes of transit, will soon be settled. It may be that the productiveness of the cotton district of the United States places the chance of competition much against the East Indian cultivation, but, on the other hand, the wages of labour are so low in India, as to form a strong drawback to the difference of production, and it remains to be seen how far it is possible to ensure the average crop of Indian cotton by improvements in the methods of cultivation.



ART. II.—*The Poetical Works of David Macbeth Moir (Delta)*. Edited by Thomas Aird. With a Memoir of the Author. In two vols. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons. 1852.

THE simple life led by almost every poet is not to be explained according to the old definition that *genius is something superhuman*, isolating its possessor from mankind, turning his very cradle into a cloud tended by unseen beings, and fixing his after home in some peculiar and spiritually-haunted sphere. There would, indeed, be no difficulty in accounting for his meagre and uninteresting history, if we had any faith in such a traditional conceit about his nature and calling. He would be as a cuckoo, only near us when he sang, and not seen by us even then. Let Dr. Beattie's 'Minstrel' be a genuine, or even a representative biography, and what *facts* does it contain but that Edwin spent his time in solitary and endless pedestrianism, roaming by day and night beside streams, groves, and hills, occasionally seeing fairies, and only once meeting with a man, and that man, too, a reverend and hoary hermit who professed to be separated from the world, not by miles, but by infinity? Genius is not something superhuman, but is the most concentrated and pure essence of humanity in its manifold existence, and intensest moods. Its mantle is of no ethereal texture, but is the very flesh of human flesh, quivering, or thrilling, or shuddering, in quickest response, to every breath of earthly influence, and all its being is thoroughly *manned*. The poet is connected with humanity, more like the race than the individual, and hence the material world belongs to him more than to others. Humanity lies within and around him, moving soul and sense, and reaching and pressing upon him from flower and star. To the common heart he is closely and directly related, as others are to their own heart. He, unresisted, passes through all the barriers of time and place, and of conventional law, from man to man, associating with, and knowing them all, just as we do in dreams. Well may the poet be called a dreamer, not because of his abstraction, but because of the very opposite—his blending himself with human beings and destinies far remote from the ken or the intercourse of his own actual lot. Indeed, the common dreamer and the great poet are, in some important respects, placed on a level. The most unimaginative clown has, when dreaming, Shakspeare's dramatic power: he enters fully into the individuality of the persons of his visions, and brings it out in genuine soliloquy, dialogue, and action.

The simplicity of the poet's history is not, therefore, to be explained by the false and mythological views of genius, to which we have referred, but is, in all cases, owing to his being but little of an actor in the world. He is a thinker—a student; and though in fellowship with man and citizenship with nature, yet his career is as uneventful as if he were a book-worm, whose earthly pilgrimage is from the top to the bottom of the pages. Byron, Scott, and Professor Wilson are exceptions, from being actors as well as thinkers.

The *Life* of a poet should be written by a brother bard, otherwise the main interest of the biography, which almost invariably hangs upon the formation and expression of the character, and not upon the course of incidents, will be missed. A prosaic acquaintance would overlook all the peculiarities which may have marked the deceased from boyhood, and which, though they shaped his labours, did not shape or stamp his lot, for the strongest idiosyncrasy is cloaked by very common-place events, and prose never pierces under these—never gets beneath the *Mr.* into the *man*. Hence the inane biographies of Shakspeare and Milton. Our poets, however, of the last half century have generally been more fortunate. Byron has had his Moore, Scott his Lockhart, and—to pass by many noble poets to whom a tribute has been paid by fitting biographers—Delta his Aird. In the last-mentioned case, the greater poet has done honour to the less, and not a few readers will take up the work which we now notice, rather because it comes from Thomas Aird, than because it is about Delta. They will eagerly lay hold of the new production of a man who has written several poems and essays, the most original and picturesque of the age, and whose only fault is that he has written so little, as if the very fulness and richness of his genius had resulted in a *plethora* to make him inactive; though still, when he does appear before the public, he shows the training and muscle of an *athlete*. The mystery about Mr. Aird's authorship is, that whilst his latest work leaves the impression that he could soon produce another of the same high class, and that, whilst as years pass by, and bring nothing more from him, you blame him for indolence, yet he sends forth—long after it was due—a new work to prove that his genius had been in daily exercise, though far too shy of tasks. Indeed, his most strongly marked characteristic is totally incompatible with indolence. That characteristic is the full, bony, and muscular structure which he gives to his ideas ere he wafts them off to float in the air of poetry. With him, the ideal always includes the real, and his smallest fancy, however delicate and fragile it may look, has a substantial frame

and a minute articulation. A lazy author would soon have lost such a characteristic.

None of Mr. Aird's admirers will class this biography with his previous productions. It is written in a style of charming simplicity, but lacks—except in a few passages—his stern grandeur of thought and diction. He was not sketching one of the mightiest sons of song, and his criticism had not to dilate itself in throwing measuring arms around the gentle Delta. Aird could only have found scope for his characteristic disquisitions on genius and poetry by pointing out the limits of Delta's powers; and friendship, all the more tender because broken off by death, seems to have forbidden such an ungracious task. When he has Professor Wilson's genius for his theme, how magnificent and sweeping, yet exquisite for discrimination, is the strain of his eulogy! But for Delta he has a genial tribute, compounded of little criticism, but of abundant affection and esteem. He rather drops flowers upon Delta's grave than hangs them upon his bust.

Whilst we have supposed that several readers will take up this 'Life' for the sake of the biographer, we doubt not that the overwhelming majority will be more interested in Delta, long and widely known as a tender poet, and the author of the delightful 'Mansie Wauch.' His was the soft lute—heard regularly during the pauses in the war-flourishes of the terrible orchestra of 'Blackwood.' Why he was *there*, sighing over faded roses and beauty, whilst Wilson and Lockhart were thundering against much good as well as much bad poetry, was a wonder to many; still the tenderness of the poetry gave him a large and constant audience. This sketch of the man will increase the general liking for his poetry; for whatever were the qualities of Dr. Moir's genius, it had no eccentricity either into habits or fits of immorality, dissipation, or improvidence. Not only did he not feel himself privileged to kick at religion, virtue, and prudence, but his whole character and conduct were imbued with their finest spirit. *He did justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly with his God.*

David Macbeth Moir was born at Musselburgh, in the beginning of 1798, of respectable parents. His mother had a fine and well cultivated intellect, was able to encourage and advise him in his first poetical attempts, and lived long enough to rejoice in his fame. Precocious excellence generally disappoints promise, and withers down into common qualities; and bright boys become dull men—to have their doings in mature strength and on a large and open stage contrasted ludicrously with their achievements at school or college. Moir was no child-prodigy. In schoolboy days, healthy sport was his main occupation; and



down to the close of his life, he spoke fondly of 'flying kites, bowling at cricket, foot-ball, spinning peg-tops, and playing at marbles.' A lengthy and very interesting extract from a series of Delta's school-reminiscences is given by Mr. Aird; but a single sentence from Dr. Chalmers' similar recollections—published in the concluding volume of the 'Memoirs,' by Dr. Hannah—when visiting his old school, is far more vivid;—'I would just like to see the place where Lizzy Green's water-bucket used to stand'—the water-bucket to which, through Lizzy's kindness, the over-heated ball-players had enjoyed free access. That 'one touch of nature'—on the part of Chalmers is far more potent—than Delta's elaborate description—to 'make the whole world'—of men looking back upon their boyhood—'kin.'

At the age of thirteen, young Moir was apprenticed to a medical practitioner in his native town. Two years later, he began the writing of poetry in his leisure moments, for then, as always afterwards, 'business first, literary recreation next, and poetry the prime of it.' In 1816, he got his diploma as a surgeon, and in the following year joined Dr. Brown, of Musselburgh, as partner in his very extensive and laborious practice. His father had just died; the support of his mother fell now upon him, and he entered bravely upon the discharge of his duties; yet even during that period of struggles, he did not neglect literature. His brother Charles says,—'When the duties of the day were over, after supper the candle was lighted in his bed-room, and the work of the desk began. Having shared the same room with him for many years in my early life, the routine of those nights is as fresh in my mind as if it had been but yesterday. He used to persuade me to retire to rest; and many a time have I awoke, when the night was far spent, and wondered to find him still at his books and pen.'

So strict was his attention to professional duties, that, from 1817 to 1828, he did not sleep a night out of Musselburgh. In this interval, however, he had 'stepped out upon the bold arena of "Blackwood's Magazine,"' and was producing poetry both sentimental and comic. It now appears that some of the cleverest squibs for which Dr. Maginn long had credit came from Moir. His introduction to Professor Wilson is described by the biographer in the following graphic way:—

'This acquaintanceship with the professor gradually ripened into a friendship not to be dissolved but at the grave's mouth. In the multi-form nature of Wilson, his mastery over the hearts of ingenuous youth is one of his finest characteristics. It is often won in this peculiar way. An essay is submitted to him as professor, editor, and friend, by some worthy young man. Mr. Wilson does not like it, and says so in general terms.

The youth is not satisfied, and in the tone of one rather injured, begs to know specific faults. The generous Aristarch, never dealing haughtily with a young worth, instantly sits down, and begins by conveying, in the most fearless terms of praise, his sense of that worth; but, this done, we be to the luckless piece of prose or numerous verse! Down goes the scalpel with the most minute savagery of dissection, and the whole tissues and ramifications of fault are laid naked and bare. The young man is astonished, but his nature is of the right sort—he never forgets the lesson—and with bands of filial affection stronger than hooks of steel, he is knit for life to the man who has dealt with him thus. Many a young heart will recognise this peculiar style of the great nature I speak of. The severe service was once done to Delta; he was the young man to profit by it—the friendship was all the firmer.—Vol. i.

Yet, though Mr. Aird does not say so, we should imagine that this friendship on Delta's side had more of reverence than of frankness, and that Galt and Maenish would be shaken more freely by the hand as familiar companions. The terms in which he repeatedly speaks of Wilson to his correspondents ('Met the Professor last night—he was bold as a lion and fierce as a tiger') indicate a feeling of awe, strong, though not unpleasant. If it be true that the men most likely to be warm friends on a full equality are those who could—if they chose—most effectively ridicule and mortify each other, and who, therefore, have a mutual apprehension under their affection, then Wilson should have been mated with Carlyle! How Carlyle could have scoffed at Wilson's exuberance of imagination and overflow of pastoral sentiment; and how Wilson's riotous humour would have dealt with 'Sartor' as with a common tailor, turning his 'immensities' into broad cloth! And then, after abusing each other, they would meet—the best of friends.

Lockhart, in his 'Matthew Wald,' makes a shrewd remark to the following effect, that whilst the clergyman sees, in exaggeration, the *best*, and the lawyer the *worst* features of human character, the doctor sees the *real*. He alone obtains a true view of men, for in his presence they are not tempted to a conscious display of greater virtue than they possess, nor to an unconscious manifestation of greater moral obliquity than commonly marks them; and he is privileged to notice and study them in their everyday lights and shades. His profession does not evoke the hypocrisy of goodness which greets the clergy when they make a call; nor does it tend to develop and harden the many repulsive forms of injustice with which lawyers become familiar, and on which they practise. On his appearance, he does not find faces lengthening as if they were yard-measures of the Ten Commandments; nor contracting and wrinkling as if they were legal quirks and snares; but they simply wear

their own natural expression. When he enters, a large Bible will not be ostentatiously open on the table, as it would be in expectation of a clerical visit; neither will he behold the disagreeable indications of a wish to gain by all means a cause—be it right or wrong—with which a lawyer is but too familiar.

But how does it happen that the doctor, having the best opportunities of acquainting himself with the realities of character, should so very seldom have put these into a *literary form*; whilst, strangely enough, at the same time, both the clergyman and the lawyer, with the serious disadvantages to which we have referred, have become distinguished artists? It cannot be that realities are tame, unromantic, and incapable of being set in interesting sketches, or embodied in fine poetry. Be the cause what it may, it is certain that doctors have contributed little to literature. Moir, however, was an exception. In 1828, he republished from Blackwood, 'Mansie Wauch,' a tale written in Dutch-like illustration of Scottish humble life and simple manners; but differing as much from Galt's novels as from Scott's. It is singular that neither before nor since has the same class of characters been sketched, though the innumerable anecdotes which circulate in private conversation chiefly relate to such characters. Scottish villages are the museums in which odd characters are collected. Almost every villager is a *character*—a shape after no pattern; his individuality strongly indenting each line of resemblance to his neighbours. We regret that Delta, endowed with the requisite powers of observation, and humorous and kindly description, did not again and again address himself to sketches of village originals. For a few pieces like 'Mansie Wauch,' we could have wanted all his poems but 'Casa Wappy.' Of the hero, Mr. Aird says finely, 'What an exquisite compound of conceit, cowardice, gossiping silliness, pawkiness, candour, kindly affections, and good Christian principle—the whole amalgam with no violent contrasts, with no gross exaggerations, beautifully blent down into verisimilitude, presenting to us a unique hero, at once ludicrous and loveable. And how admirably in keeping with the central autobiographer are the characters and scenes which revolve around his needle!'

In 1829, Moir was offered the editorship of the 'Quarterly Journal of Agriculture,' and recommended to settle as a medical practitioner in Edinburgh, where he was sure of a large and remunerative field; but both invitations he declined. In the summer of the same year he was married. In 1832, during the ravages of the cholera in Musselburgh, he fearlessly, and with extra professional zeal and charity, attended to the numerous patients, though he held the belief that cholera was



contagious. In 1838, he lost two of his children, whose death he bewailed in stanzas which for pathos have never been surpassed. Poetry from the soul of a mourning parent must be exquisite; though it requires the lapse of some interval ere the reality of grief can be suited for and transmuted into poetry. Dr. Johnson's objection to elegies has some elements of truth. A relation or friend will not, in the first troubled moment after the bereavement, think of pouring out his sorrows in melodious verse. So far we agree with the Doctor; but that that friend cannot afterwards, when the troubled soul is composed into a melancholy mood, bewail his loss in song, is egregiously untrue. He may produce the finest elegy without being exposed to the vile charge of counterfeiting grief. Who would doubt the sincerity of Milton's attachment to 'Lycidas?' We should not expect a mother to plant a rose over her son's grave on the day of burial; but if some weeks afterwards she should do this, would she forfeit the character of being an affectionate mourner? The broken heart does not make melody, and under the immediate and crushing pressure of grief the harp is hung upon the willows. Then, the only vision which fills the soul is the cold face, as unsuggestive of poetry as a mask. Genius is altogether inactive beside the unburied, beloved dead. But when the grief is becoming calm—when it can be studied as well as felt—when the soul is set free from the death-chamber, suns itself in the past, and can go backwards gleaning fondly the memorials of the precious life which has been withdrawn, and forming an image to be cherished as the substitute of the lost one, when thus the process of imagination is being begun upon the anguish, then flows freely the exquisite poetry of grief. Moir's 'Domestic Verses' consist of such poetry. 'The simple, sobbing, wailing pathos of "Casa Wappy,"' says Mr. Aird, 'has drawn more tears of mothers than any other dirge of our day. Poem we are loath to call it: such things are not made by the brain; they are the spilth of the human heart.' The dirge over his infants is also triumphant with the best hope; 'for of such is the kingdom of Heaven.' Delta's grief does not wrong the small dust which rests in the most certain hope of a blessed resurrection.

In 1845, he was thrown out of a phaeton, which rendered him lame for life. He continued, however, to attend as conscientiously as before to his professional duties, though these were now more exhausting. In 1849 he went, for the sake of his health, to the Highlands, along with Professor Wilson, who stood, during some days, for 'eight hours up to the waist in water,' following his favourite sport of fishing. It is melancholy to think that, in less than three years, Wilson has become

unable to stand even for one hour to lecture in Edinburgh College, and that his glorious professorial career is now ended. Alas! his well-known *alias*, Christopher *with the crutch*, is now his proper self.

In the spring of 1851, Delta delivered a course of lectures on the 'Poetical Literature of the past Half-century,' at the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. These were forthwith published, and we noticed them immediately on their appearance. Some remarks in the concluding lecture—to the effect that the progress of science was prejudicial to poetry, and explains the dearth of our times in great poems—excited a friendly controversy between Delta and Mr. Hugh Miller, the eminent geologist, who maintained that science would give new life to poetry, and hinted, that even if it did not, science was still greater than poetry. It is imperative that we notice these disputed points; and we think we can show satisfactorily, that whilst Delta was erroneous, Mr. Miller was very far from being correct.

We deny the alleged fact, that the present time is unpoetical. It has, indeed, produced no great poem; and the reason, we believe, is, that the poetic element has burst over its old embankments and boundaries, and flowed into the territory of general literature, leaving its old course dry, with the exception of small pools which appear here and there, such as songs, odes, and sonnets. If we cannot boast of such poets as adorned the beginning of the nineteenth century, we have at least a much larger amount of poetry, though not in the shape of verse. What would previously have been great poems are now tales, narratives, and essays; and just as Shakspeare is not less poetic in those passages of his dramas which want rhythm, neither should the age be marked as peculiarly prosaic, because abandoning verse. There may be as much alloy in the guinea as in the lump of gold; and California, still more than the Bank of England, is a golden region. The neglect of the cultivation of *poetic forms* may be wrong, but does not imply the absence or the degeneracy of the *poetic soul*.

The thought of the present is too earnestly impassioned to direct itself carefully and nicely into the old moulds. It is no capricious or whimsical order which Carlyle gives to our men of true insight—'Speak out what you have got to say, and don't waste time in trying to sing it.' Delta was then first wrong in point of fact; and so was Mr. Miller, in believing that the position of the poet has come to be recognised as inferior to that of the scientific man. A transcendently great poet would in this as in all ages, eclipse the fame of the most eminent astronomer or geologist, simply because his genius must be of a far

higher order than any science needs, tasks, or can exhaust, and because his work would be of nobler use to the soul of man. It has been well said that 'it would take many *Newtons* to make up one *Milton*;' and, we may add, all the sages that ever lived to form a Shakspeare. The fame which attends either past or present scientific discoverers is of a totally different kind from that which surrounds genuine poets and literary men. The public interest lies in the discoveries or inventions themselves, as things for knowledge and use; but the men who made them are not in uniform admiration associated with them. Are gunpowder, the telescope, the steam-engine, the electric telegraph, the planetary system, and the earth's formation, associated with those who discovered or invented them in the same invariable, unforgetful, and impassioned manner as 'Hamlet,' 'Paradise Lost,' &c. &c., are with their respective authors? Poetry is—far more than science—a thing of humanity and for humanity, and its prerogative is to connect in an immortality of admiration and love the poem with the poet. *Scientific* genius does not lay hold of a man's complete individuality; it does not absorb his identity along with all the characteristics of his nature and the associations of his life; but *poetic* genius does, and receives into its own constitution the whole being of the man, to act upon all his readers. Besides, the poet, from the very nature of his office, touches humanity at all points; whereas, the scientific man only addresses the understanding. Let it not be imagined, however, that in our comparisons we set *small* poets and litterateurs against men eminent for science. We have seen this done on the other side, when flashy and frothy contributors to literary journals were estimated alongside of Newton, Cuvier, Buckland, &c. We might as fairly put science-retailers and geological stone-breakers for schools, against Shakspeare, Milton, Byron, and Wordsworth. Let the small be set against the small, and the great against the great, and poetry at once carries off the palm from science. This is well exemplified even in Mr. Miller himself; for long after, in the progress of new geological discoveries, his *lights* shall have been lost, his *flowers* will continue to bloom in the daylight, just as, after Newton's 'Principia' is obsolete, his noble simile, descriptive of himself as but a boy gathering pebbles on the shore, with an ocean of unfathomed knowledge before him, will be remembered. The sublime muttering of Galileo—his truth after his lie—'*still it moves*'—will circulate with the revolving earth, as if it were the very sound of that earth's motion! Such immortality has a poetic saying. Mr. Miller may rest assured that this age has not taken away the stimulus to poetry by degrading the poet's position below that of the scientific man.



Along with Mr. Miller, we hold, against Delta, that poetry need not show the least resentment towards the march of science. Science may make havoc upon the old stock of fantastic materials used by small poets, but cannot destroy the tendencies or mar the creations of genuine bards. Let us hear Wordsworth on the question:—

‘Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science. The objects of the poet’s thoughts are everywhere; *he will follow wheresoever he can find an atmosphere of sensation in which to move his wings.* If the labours of men of science should ever create any material revolution, direct or indirect, in our condition, and in the impressions which we habitually perceive, the poet will be at the side of the man of science, carrying sensation into the midst of the objects of the science itself. The remotest discoveries of the chemist, botanist, or mineralogist, will be as proper objects of the poet’s art as any upon which it can be employed, if the time should ever come when these things shall be familiar to us, and the relations under which they are contemplated by the followers of these sciences shall be manifestly and palpably material to us as enjoying and suffering beings. If the time should ever come when what is now called science, thus familiarized to man, shall be ready to put on a form of flesh and blood, the poet will lend his divine spirit to aid the transfiguration, and will welcome the being thus produced as a dear and genuine inmate of the household of man.’

In relation to poetry, science is neither a master nor a conqueror, but a pioneer and a servant. Believing that no bard need be troubled with those fears of Delta’s which Mr. Miller rebuked away, we must, at the same time, express our dissent from some of Mr. Miller’s opinions. We think that he is over sanguine and positively extravagant in his expectations of the assistance which poetry is to get from matured natural science. The past does not show that the extent of that assistance has been great. It is true that geology is of too modern a date to have hitherto been largely available; and, just as when mythology is old, so when science is young, they are both too pedantic for poetry to meddle with. But astronomy, a much nobler and older science, has not been of much use to poetry; and the reasons for this in the past will be still influential in the future. Astronomy and geology may give new heavens and a new earth, yet external nature remains an *ancient* to the poet, exercising upon him the same charm which was felt by Homer, and receiving a tributary strain, which says—

‘I ask not proud Philosophy  
To teach me what thou art.’

Mind, more than matter, is the ‘main region of song,’ as it is the grand source of new sympathies and impulses. Man is more

relative to the poet than the outward world can be. The seasons of his place are little, compared with the cycles of his race. The poet is the circle and complement of progressive man, but only the parallel and counterpart of old nature. Besides, physical science, with all its discoveries of truth and corrections of error, can neither give nor take away the sensations which have been and will be imparted in a communion with the external world, whose power of sensuous impression is the very same, whether its proper organization and laws be hidden or revealed. Who can doubt that, to men collectively, the present surface of the earth, *as scenery*, covered also with associations, is and will remain far dearer than the earth's appearance and state during any of the geologic periods; and yet, nature as it is and looks at present, is but the sweet, varied, and retreating background to the interesting forms of humanity, and the order is, faces before flowers, flesh and blood before earth, sky, and ocean, and families of men and women before all other groups. Poetry would rather enter the house where human beings are than revel in the world as it was up to the sixth day of creation. The music of the spheres is a prosaic and meaningless sound compared with the low throbbings of the heart. The insensate universe is but an incidental though glorious *association*, but man is the *subject* of poetry; the sky is over *him*, earth under *him*, the ocean around *him*: and these are all, as it were, imaginary lines of latitude and longitude defining *him*. If this be true of nature as it *is*, then nature as it *was*, and was unnumbered ages ago, must be a still more remote and incidental association for poetry to deal with—scarcely, in fact, an association at all, for it does not hang over any point of the whole course of humanity.

*Man*, then, being the grand theme of song, the question is—How far can any physical science operate upon man's nature, not upon his understanding, much less upon his mechanical and conventional life, but upon his whole nature; for unless that nature—as the subject of poetry—receive important influences or changes from physical science, then the poet can only draw upon science to furnish him with a few loose illustrations and analogies not in the least homogeneous. Are Shakspeare's dramas a whit the worse from his being a poor astronomer and no geologist? The conditions, as laid down by Wordsworth, on which poetry can lay hold of science bodily, are not likely ever to be fulfilled. Science may be 'familiarized' to the understanding of the great majority of men: but can it, or, at least, *will* it, ever be 'familiarized' to their whole nature, to their sympathies, and imaginations, and sensations, like the earth and the sky? All science is valuable to the poet as *discipline* or training; but the question is concerning the worth of physical science as affording *poetic materials*. Geology

may furnish a poet with sublime lessons or illustrations to be introduced into descriptive or didactic pieces; but even in these pieces they will but be occasional, and only for a few readers, just like two or three fossils lying on the mantelpiece of a room. Nor should it be overlooked, in the case of such a geologist as Mr. Miller, who, in addition to scientific culture, possesses a poetic imagination, that he brings poetry *to*, rather than *out of*, science. His finest passages are those in which he *transfers* pictures of the existing landscape to some of the old geologic panoramas, much in the same way as Professor Nichol draws upon the scenery of the earth for the scenery of the moon.

On the 22nd of June, in dismounting from his horse, Delta received a serious injury. On the 1st of July he left, for change of scene, his native town, and went to Ayr and Dumfries. At the latter place it was at once manifest that his recovery was hopeless. He died on the 6th of July, after having fervently breathed the following prayer, which is all the finer from being destitute of poetic expression:—‘And now may the Lord my God not separate between my soul and my body till he has made a final and eternal separation between my soul and sin, for the sake of my Redeemer.’

Mr. Aird thus describes the personal appearance of his friend:—

‘Delta was tall, well formed, and erect. The development of his head was not peculiar in any way, but good upon the whole, and he carried it with a manly elevation. His hair was light, almost inclined to be sandy, and he usually wore it short. His features were regular and handsome; but he had rather too much colour, not in the cheeks merely, but diffused over the whole face. His eyes were grey-blue, mild withal, but ready to twinkle sharp. When the sense of the ludicrous was full upon him, he had a way of raising his eyebrows as people do in wonder; and there was a moist confused ferment in his eyes, glaring in the very riot and delirium of over-boiling fun. This was one of the strongest expressions of his nature; but, with the high moral powers ever watchful and dominant to chasten and subdue, it was not much indulged in. His usual tone of voice had a considerate kindness in it which was very pleasant to the ear.’

Delta’s poetry is chiefly descriptive and reflective—not imaginative. Scenery is delineated, and not idealized; thoughts and emotions are inferred from the landscape, rather than incorporated with it; and the moral hangs on the vegetation, like clothes on a hedge. It is nature unfolding herself, by a simple presentation of her features and bulk, rather than proceeding from the poetic soul, instinct with a twofold life. He is deficient, too, when he attempts to invest scenery with an historic interest. He brings out admirably the natural features and ex-



pression of a landscape ; but *the genius of the place* escapes him altogether.

Whether Delta's busy life, with his profession calling him away from his musings at any moment of the day or of the night, was favourable to the production of poetry, is not so easily settled as at first sight might appear. Uninterrupted leisure, enjoyed in unbroken seclusion, often makes study a vague, if not a vacant dream. It was believed that the last thirty years of Wordsworth's life had been accumulating several grand poems ; but, lo ! it has turned out that, during that long term passed serenely—as he had often wished—in communion with nature and his own soul, a few sonnets and other small pieces were the only fruits. The hours snatched from some secular employment frequently achieve more than days or years said to be consecrated to the service of the muses. The muses are virgins, and will allow lovers occasional interviews and dalliances, but will not marry, so as to be always in the house. The ardour with which a man who spends much of his time in some secular calling betakes himself to his desk, is but rarely felt by the seemingly more fortunate man who may sit at his desk all day long. We have an apt illustration in the case of the biographer as compared with the subject of his biography. Mr. Aird has incontestably a higher and purer poetic nature than Delta, and he has also had more leisure for the display of his gifts ; and yet he has not written one-half of the quantity of Delta's verse. Delta's laborious profession does not seem, then, to have interfered with the amount of poetry, which, considering the character of his mind, could fairly be expected from him ; nor do we think that it spoiled the quality. His genuine poetry was elegiac, as his best prose was comic ; and the medical profession furnished him with scenes to be rendered into tuneful sadness. His melody is but the echo of his tread into many chambers of affliction and death.

The two volumes of poetry, to which the 'Life' has been prefixed, do not contain the half of what Delta wrote. Mr. Aird has acted on the advice of Professor Wilson, that 'the selection should be a narrow and severe one ;' and those who are familiar with the pieces formerly published, will appreciate the taste and judgment of the editor.

ART. III.—*India in Greece ; or, Truth in Mythology.* Containing the Sources of the Hellenic Race, the Colonization of Egypt and Palestine, the Wars of the Grand Lama, and the Bud'histic Propaganda in Greece. By E. Pococke, Esq. Illustrated by Maps of the Punjaub, Cashmir, and Northern Greece. London: J. Griffin and Co. 1852.

THE inquisitive mind, wishing to penetrate the mythical and mythological clouds which obscure the regions of past time, has often proposed to itself such questions as the following:—How was Greece peopled, or colonized at the earliest period? What was its language, and whence derived? Who created its mythology, or whence came its myths? What relation have they to fact? Is Greek etymology reliable, or are we to dig deeper into antiquity, and in another land, for the roots of our historic knowledge? Are the sources of Greek mythology native or oriental? Who were the Pelasgi? These and numerous other inquiries are suggested in the reading of this volume; and we shall endeavour to furnish some notion of its contents.

It is curious to observe the various derivations of the term, which, as our author remarks, appeal to a Greek etymology in the absence of Greek history, and thus conduct to no practical result. Pelasgi is taken from Pelagos, 'the sea'—intimating they were a people who came into Greece by sea. Another explanation is found in Pelagoi, 'Storks,' from the lower dress of that people, or from their wandering habits. Peleg is also adduced. Müller and Wachsmuth choose Pelargos as the primary form of the word, and derive it from *pelo*, 'to till,' and *agros*, 'a field.' Another etymology is from *pelazo*, and another supposes the people were called *Pelasgoi* from their own barbarous language. Mr. Pococke lays down the following as the etymological and historical basis. *Pelasa* was the ancient name for the province of Bahar, (so denominated from the *Pelasa*, or *Brutia Frondosa*, a large tree of the mountains). *Pelaska* is a derivative form of *Pelasa*, whence the Greek, *Pelasgos*. The Pelasgi spoke the Sanscrit language; and the Greek is a derivation from the Sanscrit. Those who spoke the former language, therefore, must have come into Greece—that is, they were the Indians, or first settlers, whose language then became corrupted or modified. Now, the province of Bahar was the stronghold of Bud'hism which the Brahmins detested. The fierce and prolonged contest between these rival sects issued at length in the expulsion of the

Bud'hists, whose country then poured its expatriated population into many regions of Asia and of Europe. Hence arises the term Pelasgic Hellas, or Greece. The peculiar claim to preference in regard to this derivation is, that it is historic rather than etymological; and, therefore, that a conjectural etymology, which is solely founded on a corrupted language, is displaced, as it surely ought to be, by facts which have relation to the geography of distant countries, and the movements of tribes and people in a remote antiquity. Mr. Pococke's work comprises an account of the locality of the Bud'hist emigration in Affghanistan and North-western India; and the occupation of Greece, Egypt, Palestine, and Italy; whence arose the great Scandinavian families, with the early Britons. Thus the way is opened to the revision of Grecian history, and the detection of the truths which lie concealed in Grecian mythology. The labours of the Bud'hists in Greece are traced, and the wars of the Great Lama, together with the localities of the Pelasgi and the Sindian colonists of Palestine and Italy. These new interpretations of ancient documents, if well founded and substantiated by geographical evidence, plainly affect the question of the originality of the Greek and Latin languages, and are alike important to the classical and scriptural student, to the searcher into ancient history and antiquarian lore.

The first subject of consideration respects the evidences of an Indian colonization. This is indicated in the reproduction of India in Greece, as manifested in the habits and language of a portion of its early possessors. In the heroic period of Greece we find the perfection of the arts, the profusion of golden vessels, ornaments of ivory, embroidered shawls, the products of the needle and the loom, carving and sculpture, and whatever else distinguished oriental elegance and luxury, thus bespeaking their origin. The Sanscrit was the language of Pelasgic and Hellenic Greece; a fact which may unravel the earliest poetic fallacies. 'Amidst the numerous dialects which compose the English language,' says our author, 'the Saxon has left the strongest impression upon our native tongue. The deduction, therefore, independent of history, is, that people once speaking the Saxon language lived in this island: it is then equally clear that these were Saxons. Apply this to Greece. What strikes us so forcibly as this identity of structure, of vocables, and inflective power, in the Greek and Sanscrit languages?' The Greek language is a derivation from the Sanscrit; therefore Sanscrit-speaking people—that is, Indians—must have dwelt in Greece, and this dwelling must have preceded the settlement of those tribes which helped to produce the corruption of the old language; in other words, the Indians must have been the primi-



tive settlers—at least they must have colonized the country so early, and dwelt so long, as to have effaced all dialectic traces of any other inhabitants. The evidence of this fact derives additional confirmation from the transference of geographical names, and from the philosophy, mysteries, and religion of the mighty East. It would not be sufficient to weaken, much less to overthrow this argument, to allege, that a considerable portion of the influence in question might have sprung from traditionary causes and from the incidental, it might be the frequent, visitations of travellers, or others, from the distant lands, who, in the course of time, infused their notions, habits, and observances into the general mass of the aboriginal inhabitants of the soil; because the question lies between Greece and India, and the origin of attainable history in the remotest times, and because it is not conceivable that the entire language, literature, customs, and religion of a people, and the alteration of the very names of their mountains, rivers, and various localities, could have been accomplished by stray visitors or temporary means. The annihilation or formation of a language, in particular, seems to be the inevitable result of conquest or colonization.—

‘We are ignorant, let us not deny it, of the simple meaning of the name of nearly every place in Greece; and yet we flatter ourselves that we are writing what we call Classical Geographies and Grecian Histories. But now mark the perilous position to which this admission will reduce us. If we, through either the vanity or the ignorance of Greeks, are unacquainted with the original import of the geographical nomenclature of Greece, then are we equally ignorant of the history of that period, if our Grecian informants have not, with historical facts, given us the full value of *historical names*.

‘What I have now to show is, that they have given us those names; but as those names have no *signification* attached, they are historically, as the earliest map of Greece is *geographically*, worthless; nay, more, they have led, and still lead us, astray. They have told us of Pelasgoi and Pelargoi, and forthwith our literati expend their energies upon problems impossible of solution, with the feeble means at their disposal. They attempt to draw from the Greek language, a language not in existence at the Pelasgian settlement of Hellas,—a history of the origin of the Pelasgians,—a process similar to an investigation of the origin of the Saxons, by the sole aid of the English language.

‘What then, having confessed our ignorance of men and things in the olden times of Greece, that is, in the time of the Pelasgian race,—what then is the remedy? Simply to refer to the *Pelasgian*, instead of the *Greek* language, for solid information in lieu of fabulous commentary. Is that language still in existence?—It is. It is the Sanscrit, both pure, and in the Pali dialect: sometimes partaking of the form and substance of the Cashmirean, and very often of the structure and vocables of the old

Persian. But what, it will be asked, is your proof of this? My proof is one of the most practical that can be imagined; a proof geographical and historical; establishing identity of nomenclature in the old and new country of the Greek settlers, and acquiring the power, by this language, of restoring to plain common sense the absurdities of the whole circle of Greek literature, from Hesiod and the Logographers downwards.'—pp. 23, 24.

The cause of the Indian emigration is traceable in the following manner. A religious war prevailed for a long period, and to a great extent throughout that country, which issued in the expulsion of vast multitudes of people. Driven from the Himalayan mountains on the north, and across the valley of the Indus on the west, they carried with them art and science into Europe. The Brahminical and Bud'hist sects were the two great combatants; and the former being victorious, the latter sought refuge in Bactria, Persia, Asia Minor, Greece, Phœnicia, and Britain. In the Greek language alone—that is, the modified Sanscrit which we receive as Greek, in its disguises and transmutations, there are evidences of this position. The author first takes a connected view of this immense emigration, and then of its subordinate results in the actual progression and final settlement of the true Hellenic populations. The former part of this subject is discussed in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of the volume; the sixth introduces us to the Hellenes.

The term Hellas was derived from the range of mountains in Beloochistan, called the Hela mountains, which are connected by another range with the lofty region of Affghanistan. The chiefs of the country were denominated Helaines, or chiefs of the Hela. Mr. Pococke expresses a confident persuasion, that both the name of the mountain and that of the chiefs was of a secondary form—namely, *Heli*, 'the sun,' proving that they were of the genuine race of Rajpoots, who were all worshippers of that luminary. The formation of the term Helenes in Sanscrit, would be identical with the Greek. Helen, the Sun-king, is said to have left his kingdom to Aiulus, his eldest son, while Dorus and Xuthus were sent to conquer foreign lands. Haya was a warlike tribe of Rajpoots, the worshippers of Bal, or the sun. They were also called Asii, or Aswa, and their chiefs Aswa-pas. The Aswas descended from the Amoo, or Oxus—the Oxud-racæ, or Rajos of the Oxus, and their kingdom was Oox-ina, or Euxine. This sea was said to be called Axeinos, or the *inhospitable*, and was then changed to Eu-xeinos, the *hospitable*. Ooxa with ina, will, by the rules of Sandhi, exactly make the old name Ookshainos (Αἰεῖνος). Thus the Greek *Myth*, observes our author, is Αἰεῖνος, 'the inhospitable' (*sea*); the Sanscrit *History*, Ookshainos, 'the chiefs of the

Oxus.' These mighty tribes, from their appellation 'Asii,' gave the name to the continent of 'Asia.' After tracing the Athenians to Affghanistan, and following the emigrations along the course of the Indus, touching on the Locri, the Bœotians, the Tettiges, or people of Tatta, Mount Kailas, which gave the name koilon, heaven, to the Greeks, and cœlum to the Romans, and referring to the correspondences of manners and habits, our author proceeds:—

'Such is a description of the great river of the Indus and its border inhabitants at this day; and such, no doubt, judging by the steadfastness of the oriental type, both in language and custom, were the inhabitants on the banks of this celebrated stream from the most remote periods. Can we now, after surveying the primæval settlements of the Cor-Indi, and those people of the sea-board Attac, the Tattaikes, wonder at the happy choice of locality made by both these great mercantile people? We see that both came to their new country fraught with all the appetences and qualifications of a great commercial people; both made a most brilliant, as well as judicious, choice of their respective coasts and harbours, and both ran a noble career in the civilization of their species. The early abundance of gold—the graceful fabrics of the loom, and the arts of embroidery—these and a host of similar peculiarities distinctive of oriental life, all are now satisfactorily accounted for, by the simple geographical evidence of the exact origin and locality of the classical Athenian and Corinthian. What can be more thoroughly Indian than Homer's description of the venerable Nestor's cup:—

"Next, her white hand an antique goblet brings,  
A goblet sacred to the Pylean kings  
From oldest time; embossed with studs of gold,  
Two feet support it, and four handles hold:  
On each bright handle bending o'er the brink  
In sculptured gold, two turtles seem to drink."

'The early civilization then—the early arts—the indubitably early literature of India, are equally the civilization, the arts and the literature of Egypt, and of Greece—for geographical evidences, conjoined to historical fact, and religious practices, now prove beyond all dispute, that the two latter countries are the colonies of the former.'—pp. 73. 74.

In pursuance of the general argument, we are now introduced to the northern tribes, or the group situated in North-western Epirus, Bullini, Taulantii, and Chaonia. Bullini is the Greek form of writing Bolani, the people of the Bolan; a pass in Beloochistan, or rather a succession of ravines and gorges, on the route from Northern Sinde to Kandahar. The Talan, or people of Tal or Tull, lie to the north-west of the Bullini, in the desert of Sewestan. Chaonia, in Greece, was represented in Affghanistan as Kahun, a little to the south-west of the Bolan Pass. Thus the Taulantii, Bullini, and Chaonia,



in Greece, are the reflections of the Talan, Bolani, and Cahun in Affghanistan; and the mountains of Kheran are the Kerannii Montes, or Thunder Mountains of Chaonia.

The mountain chain of *Pindus*, traversing Greece, midway between the Ægean and Ionian Seas, forming the boundary of Thessaly and Epirus, is named from the Pind, or 'Sall Range' of Affghanistan, which stretches to the River Jailum in the Punjaub. An ancient race inhabited these heights called the Athamanes, whose habits resembled the North American tribes, who are of the same stock with the ancient Hellenes. The Ac-Helous or Hela's water, the largest river in Greece, so called from the Hela mountains in Sinde, traverses the whole country from north to south, like the Indus in the Punjaub. 'There is a remarkable point in Greece where four mountain ranges converge; the Cambunian, Pindus, Tympha, and Lacmon. The latter glows like a gem, throwing its light on the noble bosom of Hellas. Behold in Mount Lacmon, the Lughman of Affghanistan. To this central point run the Pindus and the Athamanian mountains in Greece, the Pind and the Damian mountains in Affghanistan—now blending with Lacmon, Mount Kerkutius, runs nearly north and south, while advancing north to Lughman, Mount Kerketcha, rivets this powerful geographical evidence.'

The ninth chapter of this volume refers to the Himalayans, containing, as we shall presently see, a curious and interesting development of a portion of our national history. Three separate groups of colonists came from north-western Asia into Greece. The Ac-Helous, or Helas-water, is the representative of the Indus; the Sancios (Paen-i-Os, 'the chiefs of the Ookshus,' or Oxus); and the Sperchius (river of Sverga) of the Ganges. The Ionians, after their emigration, formed on the western banks of the Pindus. From this branch, noticed by the Hebrew legislator as Javan, was named the Hiyania (Ionian) Sea, and Hipairus (Epirus). It is to be observed, that the southern boundary of Thessaly is edged by a powerful body of Bud'hists, and thus the inhabitants of a northerly latitude descended from the north-westerly boundaries of the Punjaub, and the frontiers of Thibet, and with them the names of their mountainous dwelling places: and here mythology and history are one, carrying up the Hindoo system to a vast antiquity. Among the Bud'hists, to the south of Othnys, were the Lamunses, or Lama tribes. To the south of Lamia, the chief city, or Lamas' town, is the River Durus, Dras, or Draus of Thibet, which flows through a valley of that name, near the northern rontier of Cashmere. Bordering on the people of Lamas, extending eastward as far as Thermopylæ, were the Dryopes,

so named from 'Drus,' an oak, and 'Ops,' the voice—the Greeks insinuating that they spoke from the oak. These people, however, are no mythological beings, but Dru-o-pes, or 'chiefs of the Draus,' and their southern settlement is in Doris, on the river Chara-dras (Kira-Dras), or the Cashmir Dras, where they again appear as Dryopes. They are also among the Cassiopæi, or Cashmirians, at the sources of the Chara-dras (Kira-dras), in Epirus.

'So much for truth and so much for fable. The truth is the Sanscrit version, the fable is the Greek; yet both fable and truth repose upon an historical and geographical basis.

'But I cannot be content with a passing notice of the people of the Dras; for, as a nation, we are deeply interested in their early history. Not only so, we have been closely connected with them; and, farther still, long did they dwell in our island, and by the interesting records and traditions concerning them that have descended to our own times, they have provoked our unabated and lively curiosity. Why should I conceal the fact? These DRUO-PES are our own ancient DRUI-DES or DRUIDS!

"Hark! 'twas the voice of harps, that poured along  
The hollow vale the floating tide of song.  
I see the glittering train, in long array,  
Gleam through the shades, and snowy splendours play;  
I see them now with measured steps and slow,  
'Mid arching groves the white-robed sages go.  
The oaken wreath with braided fillet drest—  
The Crescent beaming on the holy breast—  
The silver hair which waves above the lyre,  
And shrouds the strings, proclaim the Druid;  
They halt, and all is hushed."

'These venerated sages, chiefs of the tribes of the Draus, were of the INDU VANSA or LUNAR RACE. Hence the symbol of the CRESCENT worn by these Druids; they too, like most of their race, were Bud'hists, and they shall tell their own history. Their chief settlement here, was "the E-BUDES," i.e., "HI-BUD'H-DES," and their last refuge in Britain from the oppression of the Romans, the descendants from their own stock, was the "Isle of Saints" or "Mona." This is indeed the Druid Bard—this, the minstrel of the Cymry—this, the Bhaut of the ancient Rajpoot—this, the harper of Homeric song—this, the Demodocus of Homeric feasts—this, the glorious minstrel, who, in the guise of a divinity, draws homage from his fellows—this, in truth, the Delphic god—this, the founder of the wealthy shrine, the oracular response—this, the subject of the glowing lay, the living faith of the Homerid of Chios. This is the god, who, from his lofty watch-tower, spies the tall bark of Crete as it ploughs its way towards the Peloponnesus; he it is, whom the Bud'hist poet glorifies with the ascription of saintly power over the elements of nature.

'The settlement of the people of the Draus in this island, the northern

part of which was essentially that of the HI-BUDH-DES (E-BUDH-DES), or the land of the Hiya Bud'has, at once accounts most satisfactorily for the amazing mechanical skill displayed in the structure of Stone Henge, and harmonises with the industrious and enterprising character of the Buddhists throughout the old world; for these are the same people who drained the valley of Cashmir, and in all probability the plains of Thessaly.'—pp. 102-104.

Mr. Pococke proceeds to show that the Lapithæ and Centaurs (Kentauroi) are *not* fabulous, that Cheiron was the instructor of Achilles, living on Mount Pelion, from which, like the other Centaurs, he was expelled by the Lapithæ. The most celebrated heroes in Grecian story are described as the pupils of Cheiron, distinguished for hunting, medicine, music, gymnastics, and the art of prophecy. The people called Kentaurioi by the Greeks were among the settlers in eastern Thessaly, emigrants from Kandahar. The history of the celebrated oracle of Dodona is rescued from its mythological character by the town Dodo, in the northern Punjab, amidst the mountains south of Cashmir. The tribe Dodo, or Dor, is the most ancient of the thirty-six Rajpoot tribes of the Hiya or Aswa Sachas. The powerful state of this great tribe is also proved by their people being the central point of the Soo-Meroo, the mountain of glory, the Olympus of the Hindoo deities, which, both in the Punjab and in Greece, is a geographical position. About thirty miles to the south of the Greek To-Maros are the people called Cassiopæi, who came from the Y'Elumio-tis, or 'land of the river Yelum,' which encircles their western and north-western frontier. They are the tribes of Cashmir, the Casyapas; and here we have a geographical base for supposed mythological tale, being brought into juxtaposition with the most important point in India for an historical foundation. The most authentic document of north-western India (now made synonymous with northern Greece), is the Rajatarangini, written at Cashmir, whenever the Cassopæi set out on their emigration, to Greece. It is a record of the princes of that famous valley, whose chronicles extend into the remote antiquity of B.C. 2448, contemporaneous, as the biblical student will recollect, with the birth of Japhet. Both Chæroncia and Plateia are settlements from this district, which thus gave to Hellas her stock of vigorous warriors, splendid poets, and beautiful daughters. As the geography of north-western India is the geography of northern Greece, so will it be found that their histories are identical. The heroes of India are the gods of Greece, and the process of deification continued down to the most historical periods. The doctrine of *Greek invention* is thus set aside.

The worship of the sun and moon gave a distinctive title to



the hierarchies of the solar and lunar races—a title applied to the primeval inhabitants of the world. When we read of the ‘children of the sun,’ or ‘children of the moon,’ these titles are not to be regarded as mythological, but as designating two vast sections of the human family, traceable in the annals of the Apian land, and of Egypt, Rome, and Peru; and thus in India the two great dynasties were divided into the Surya Vansa, or Solar dynasty, and the Chandra Vansa, or Lunar dynasty, of whom the former were the earliest settlers in Greece, and their religious teachers the Dodan, or Brahminical priests of the great tribe Doda. The earliest records we have of their worship are the Vedas, which consist of invocations to the sun, moon, winds, and other agents of nature. In time, the Lunar race, Bud’ha being its head, adopted the worship of one God. This occasioned a vast and long-continued religious warfare. Our author shows, by an elaborate production of evidence, that the same errors of record which have disfigured the annals of primeval Greece, have not spared those of Asiatic countries, and that the names, for instance, of ‘Iran and Turan,’ as the warlike parties described in the Persian annals, correctly interpreted, would exhibit fact as the foundation of fable, just as the Greeks of antiquity conceived Sanscrit vocables to be Greek. Ira was the wife of Bud’ha; Airan, the plural form, the people of Bud’ha, and Iran and Irania their land. Turan was a corrupt form of Suran. Sura, the sun, Suran, the suns, or sun tribes.

The line of the Oxus and the northern Indus sent forth the inhabitants to colonize Egypt and Palestine. The Indian tribes, under the appellation of Surya, or the Sun, imparted its lasting name to Suria, that is Syria. Ægypt (Græcè Aiguptia), was so called from its colonists, the h’Ai-gopati, settlers from the same land with the Hya or Horse tribes, chiefly the ‘children of the sun,’ worshippers of Gopati, a term signifying at once the Sun, the Bull, and Siva, a portion of whom were the Cushites. Cusha was a son of Rama, sovereign of Oude, in whom Rameses took its rise; the members of the same solar dynasty giving the title to Ramoth-Gilead, one of its settlements in Syria. Rameses was king of the city designated from his mother Cushali. His sons were Lova and Cush, who originated the races which may be termed Lovites, and Cushites, or Cushwas of India. Rama and Chrishna are both painted blue, holding the lotus, emblematic of the Nile. Their names are often identified, Ram-Chrishna, the bird-headed divinity. Both were real princes, though Chrishna assumed to be an incarnation of Vishnu, as Rama was of the Sun.

Egypt was called by the Hebrews Misraim, a mode of writing Mahes’ra-im, the Hebrew plural of Mahes’ra, the name of Siva.

Egypt and the neighbouring countries are representative both of the high northerly latitudes of the Himalayas, Thibet, and Oude, and of the more southerly provinces of the Indus.

It has been mentioned that a people inhabiting the vicinity of the Himalayan mountains and the province of Ladakh settled in the land of Egypt; that people are again visible in Palestine; the Tartarian population went to the northern part, while the tribes of Oxus passed into Canaan. Their various localizations are traced in the names of the places and districts occupied. Monuments still remain of the Greek connexion with Phœnicia. The Phœnicians were emigrants from a district in Affghanistan, called the Hya Bud'hists. It appears that the Cuvera of the Hindoos, the Pataikoi (Lunar tribes) of the Phœnicians, and the Cabeiri of the Greeks, are simply distorted records of the facts of Bud'hist worship, industry, and wealth, abounding in Kaiber, that is, the Cabeiri or people of Khyber; that is also the Khebreui, or Hebrews, or Hyperboreans, whom the Greek writers celebrate for their piety. Five things are distinctly seen, namely, the identical localities in the Indian and Tartarian provinces whence Palestine was colonised, identity of idolatry between India and Palestine, the use of the war-car both in the provinces of India and those of Syria, the identity of the rajpoot of India and of Palestine, and the notification of the distinct tribe which the Israelites encountered and overthrew. The Philistines were the most ancient original tribes of India, a branch of the people of Haman, called by classical writers Allophuli (that is, Halaphula), the tribes of the Hala mountains (Hela), the ancestors of the Hellenes; and thus we are brought into contact with the Hellenes from the coasts of Phœnicia.

The author pursues his ingenious, and, as we think, his truthful, representations further, under the general heads of Time, the basis of error and truth, Hesiod's History of Greece, Phœnician Bud'hism, Apollo, the Bud'hism of Ladag and the Ladachaimen, the Attac'mans, and the Bud'hist missionary; but our space will not permit us to follow him even in an abridged detail. We can only now just refer to the second of these articles. He would have it distinctly remembered, in referring to former statements in connexion with the tracing of Hesiod's History, that in contemplating the geographical facts, as recorded on the mountains and rivers of Hellas, *history* has been equally reviewed in the names assigned to them by those people. If any discrepancies are to be found between the writers and the state of society, those writings must be either fabrications grounded on pure inventions or the perverted relics of ancient history. If the Cyclopes, the Autochthons, the Athenian Grasshoppers, Cheiron, and others have been found gross perversions of plain

fact, these names and others occurring in the writings of Hesiod and the Logographers will be chargeable with corrupt orthography, and corrupt history based upon that orthography, the representative to Hesiod of words apparently Greek, but really Sanscrit, Thibetan, or the Pehlari dialects. The outlines of such history may be authentic, while the features of individuals are distorted; and such is Hesiod's history.

The author of 'India in Greece' may fairly claim the merit of discerning a vast corrupted text running throughout the geography of the world as known both to the Greeks and Romans. And indeed how could it be otherwise? Is Herodotus our informant? 'Though we do not question his veracity, we may reasonably doubt his power to write the names of tribes or mountains correctly which were caught only by the ear, and reduced to no uniform standard. Suppose a well-informed Frenchman, skilled only in his own language, to have visited this country, and, guided only by the ear, to have taken down the names of our chief towns, rivers, and mountains, is it probable they would be easily recognised by a native of England? Supposing, further, Rosbif, Boulingrin, and Redingote, to be geographical terms, what Englishman, unaware of the Gallic system of metamorphosis would have imagined them to have been Roast-beef, Bowling-green, and Riding-coat? We knew a friend who was once much puzzled on being informed by a Parisian that he had a brother living at *Suzanton*. He at length discovered that this *terra incognita* was to be interpreted by the ordinary Anglo-Saxon form of *Southampton*!

Mr. Pococke's chapters on the Bud'hism of Ladak and the Ladake-men (Lakadæmon), and the Indian origin of the worship of Apollo, are of singular interest. The existence of Bud'hism in the sixth century before Christ, as an authenticated historical fact, is indispensable; and authorities adduced by M. Rémusat and other eminent orientalisks leave no reason to doubt of a venerable succession of Lamas in Tibet, of whom the last Budha, so copiously noticed in the Mahavansa of Ceylon, seems to have formed the extreme link. The classification of the ancient people of Khiva, the Amoo (Oxus), and the R. Gilghit and Bashan, as the Hivites, Amorites, Gilgites, and people of Bashan of Scripture, with the Tartarian Cocaunes (Græcè Caucones), appears to rest upon a sound and natural basis, especially taking into consideration the singular coincident antiquity of these roving tribes, both in Greece and in the Holy Land.

Our author has certainly shown a Tartarian population in Palestine on the entrance of the Israelites; and if to these we add the Girgishi (Gergishites) as the Tartarian Kirghis of the Oxus or Huesos, such evidence cannot but possess an historical



value. In connexion with the primitive Tartarian population of Greece, the author's reading of the usual Greek text *Helotes*, or *Eilotes*, is a most happy one. To us he appears to have restored the true form, namely, 'Eluths,' or, as given by excellent authorities, *Oeloets*, another member of those vast Tartarian tribes whom he has pointed out to the north of Greece as the *Maghedan*, or *Moguls*, shepherd warriors, possibly the *Abheras* of the Sanscrit. This version would give us, both in Greece and Palestine, at nearly the same relative era, a similar population; and it would rationally account for the term, of which no satisfactory definition has hitherto appeared in Greek etymological principles. Even Müller's origin of the term, as *είλωτες*, 'prisoners,' is very tame. His supposition, however, of their being an aboriginal race, reduced to early serfdom, receives the stamp of truth from this interpretation; for we are thus not only directed towards the subjugation of a primitive Tartarian population, but to the suppression of the early worship prescribed only in the mysteries of Greece. The most extraordinary demonstration of the existence of this first Tartarian religion is to be found in Mr. Pococke's translation from the Thibetan of the celebrated Elusinian formula, 'Konx Om Pax,' to penetrate whose mysteries many attempts have been made, but all ineffectually till the present time. The full formula is given to us in the celebrated abstract of the sacred Thibetan books by Csoma de Cörös. The antiquity of these famed mysteries has never been questioned; and the fair inference to be drawn from the important fact of the use of the Thibetan language, coupled with the slavery of the Eluths and the wanderings of the Cocaunes is, that the earliest population of Greece was Tartarian or Tibeto-Tartarian. This consideration alone will explain the confusion into which the early history of Greece is thrown, and will demonstrate the feasible formation of a mythology based upon Tartarian terms, and evolved by a language so flexible as the Greek. Thus the popular Greek idea of the Helots, as recorded by Myron, that these serfs were compelled to 'wear a dog-skin cap and a garment of sheep-skins,' is not, as our author has shown, to be attributed to them as a badge of Spartan degradation, but as the ordinary Tartarian clothing of the Eluth (Helot) race. Mr. Pococke's extraordinary development of these facts is in complete harmony with the researches of the most celebrated ethnologists. Both Dr. Prichard and the great Egyptologist, the Chevalier Bunsen, look to the high table lands of Asia as the early place of sojourn for the human race. In accordance with the twofold movement to the East and to the West, we observe that the author takes an enlarged and comprehensive view of mankind, and points out the harmonic

progression of settlements in Greece, Egypt, and Palestine. This portion of the work is more hastily dismissed, and therefore more scantily supported, than the importance of the subject demanded. A rigid scrutiny as to the sources whence the original picture of primitive society is drawn must be expected, but there is so evident a conviction of the truth of his system of research pervading the tone of the writer, that it is entitled to the utmost candour and respect. Whatever errors may be found, this process of investigation is the only one that can afford any chance of the recovery of the ante-historic era of our race, not only in Greece, but throughout the ancient world. It is not to be expected that the sagacity, the learning, and the wide research requisite for the restoration and interpretation of a corrupt text, so vast as the entire nomenclature of ancient geography, will readily be found centred in an individual; but we agree with Mr. Pococke, that text *is* to be interpreted, and we moreover feel that he has been eminently successful in the main outlines of his work, and has shed much light upon the primitive history of our race.

It may, indeed, be asked, Where *is* the history? The answer, we think, is a sound one, 'The geography *is* the history.' The names of rivers, mountains, and seas, that is to say, are historic documents; the only question is the interpretation. In this volume there is an identity which goes far towards an historical value, though we may doubt the identity of mere towns in Thessaly with towns in India. This, indeed, is one of the weak points of the evidence; but the case is widely different in the identification of vast communities, large rivers, or chains of mountains, for these may be fairly regarded as the interpretative *lexica* of the respective populations dwelling in their vicinity; and if Mr. Pococke had confined himself solely to these strong points, his base of operation would have been more commanding and secure. Still we are satisfied that the principle laid down is one of great importance. It seems to us a defect that the author has not exhibited fully and methodically that philological basis upon which the results have been wrought out, presupposing, we presume, that his reader is as familiar with it as himself. He therefore dismisses with a passing allusion facts which should have received a notice alike plain, distinct, and detailed.

The chapters on the quasi-identity of Bud'hism and the papal system, as the rival representatives of the true church, are admirable, as they present a species of theological anatomy of the eastern and western races. The ritual, the dress, the miracles, the relics, and a long train of similar exhibitions, which our author has not inaptly described as marking the

'Hierarchy of senses,' connect the Rome of the present day with the Bud'histic system of Ceylon, and not improbably with the Lamaism of antiquity.

The author has not allowed sufficient scope to the Tartarian portion of the first population of Greece, and has laid too great a stress upon its quasi-Indian totality. In this way it is probable that he has written down as purely Himalayan, not a few who should have been classed among the Sogh-pa, or the wanderers of the Mongolian prairies. He has apparently lost sight of the extent of the great migratory tribes of antiquity, and has attributed to fragmentary sections of their race an importance which should only attach to their entire horde. On further investigation, we believe, he will be found to have contracted the sources of the primitive races, which, both from the testimony of classical writers and from the analogy of early Biblical ethnology, must have been essentially nomadic; in fact, both warlike and pastoral. We are rather sceptical of the origin of the Hellenes as 'chiefs of Hela,' on historical grounds, whatever the evidence may appear to be philologically. A rigid adherence to philology has led to the adoption of an opinion which Indian traditions do not support, notwithstanding the presumed aboriginal position of the Brahmoic tribes. The account of the settlers in the Ægion, as the 'Aigaias' (Vijaquas) of Mahabaraliam history, and the origin of the term and race of the Hai-gopati (Aigupti), however natural, are, from the author's own canon, hardly to be accepted. He has shown us no geographical monogram, to stamp them with the same historical value as the existence of the Caucones and the Adrian tribes; and, again, though we grant the singular harmony of the position of the Pindus of Greece and the Pind of the Punjab, as compared with their surrounding settlements, we cannot but conceive, taking this primal feature of Greece in connexion with the Othrys or Himalaya, it should rather be considered as the 'Bindhus' or Vindhya—the great range that traverses India from Bahar (Pelasa and the Pelasga of our author) nearly to Guzerat. We should thus have the two greatest mountain chains of both countries—the Bindhya and the Odrys, the Pindus and the others—adequately and most beautifully represented, and a higher historical value imparted to our author's discoveries. To sum up the purely historical results of these independent researches, we have for the first time disclosed to us in Greece and its border lands two great populations; the one primary, the other secondary settlers. We had given these in a tabular form, but want of space compels their omission.

We now ask, then, What tribe was that, which, first appear-



ing as a bright streak upon the north-eastern horizon of Greece, is seen, like the sun, to glow more and more over the land of classic song? What but that which was at first seen to shine above the peaks of Othrys? In their vicinity we mark the small band of Hellas, and not only is the first home of this tribe in the neighbourhood of what our author calls the 'Himalaya Nova,' but, as though to mark more strongly their antecedent abode of towering peaks, vast glens and mighty torrents, Hellas is first seen immediately to the north of 'Kaila' (Kæla) the name of the highest peak of the Othrys (Odrys), or Himalaya of India. Our long nurture in the autochthonous lore of Greece must not induce us to condemn such evidences as this, to which we cannot attribute a fortuitous character. Here a philological chain of research has undeniably drawn after it historical results of great value. Thus, everything is in harmony: a language, called the Greek, confessedly derived from an Indian language, called the Sanscrit; Indian mountains, the most striking in physical geography; Indian peaks, the most famous in mythology; Indo-Tartarian tribes, whose appellation conquest has never obliterated, and whose population still subsists under its aboriginal titles.

To the question, then, which naturally arises, Is the whole of mythology purely inventive; or is it only so in part, and what proportion does the historical bear to the fabulous; we reply that there is an unusually strong ground for suspecting the existence of some ruined temple of time, from whose foundation many of these visions of antiquity shall come forth to sear or to charm us. The Iliad and Odyssey in Greece, the Shah-Nameh in Persia, and the Ramayuna in India, amply establish this fact.

In the absence of distinct historical records, there is one test which may be applied with positive advantage to mythological coinages—namely, the science of ethnology. With the canon laid down by Mr. Pococke, we entirely agree. Granting the origin of a nation to be ascertained, we may reasonably expect that its geographical nomenclature may be explained from its own language. If it cannot be explained, we may conclude, not only that the language of the original settlers has become practically lost, but that, together with that loss, there has been an entire misapplication of primitive terms, allusions, and customs, which have, in their turn, been fitted to more modern usages, and to language of homogeneous sound. Thus, for example, assuming the cradle of the Hellenic race to have been India, it cannot reasonably be expected that the most ancient names of its rivers and mountains can be explained by an interpretation from the Greek. On this principle we con-

sider our author particularly happy in his illustration of the Cyclopes. Here is an instance where, granting the colonization of Greece to have been from India, a satisfactory account is at once given of 'Greek fable and Indian truth.' The Greek fable, to use our author's words, is of the giants of 'the round eye' (κυκλιος); the Indian translation tells us of the 'chiefs of the Jumna,' (Gok-'la-pes.) Take, again, the Cyclades. The Greek etymologist informs us, that these islands were called κύκλαδες, from their lying in a circle round Delos. This is very jejune. A translation from the language of the first colonists informs us, that the term signifies 'the land of the people of the Jumna;' and thus the Cyclades and the Cyclopes are brought into historical connexion.

Again, we would ask with Mr. Pococke, what can the Greek scholar make of a term so non-Hellenic as Othrys? There is no such Greek word; and he is obliged to apply to some form as Ὀρθιος, 'the straight' or 'the steep' mountain. How much truth and simplicity appear at once in the reading of Othrys as Odrys—that is, the Himalayan mountains; for, in the philological part of his system (which, by the bye, we could have wished more in detail), Mr. Pococke has demonstrated that the *th* of the Greek, corresponded in sound to the *dh* of the Sanscrit, and in fact that there are in the masterly work of Bopp, constant proofs of the equivalent forms *th* Greek, and *dh* Sanscrit. Hence the reader will easily perceive the reason why Adris or Odrys appears as Othrys, scarcely any difference existing between the Greek and Sanscrit sounds. In fact, this is simply the process of archaic structure in the Latin language, in which we find *triumphe* as *triumpe*. A familiar example is evident in such words as *théâtre* in the French language, where, for all practical purposes, the *h* is of no service.

We shall hail the further treatment of this investigation, and trust that the inquiry will be conducted upon a purely geographical basis;—being assured, if this principle be rigidly adhered to, and if the same sagacity which has detected beneath the nomenclature of the great nations of antiquity authentic facts, be restrained within legitimate bounds, that results of much importance to the knowledge of the ante-historical period must ensue. Whatever speculative errors may obscure the demonstrative character of Mr. Pococke's volume, he is entitled to the credit of having been the first to discover, and to apply to historical purposes, those treasures which have for innumerable years lain unnoticed and unvalued by the historian and the philologist. His inquiry is not one we can afford to despise. He has opened to view a rich vein, which literary labourers, possessed of the requisite talents and sagacity, will not fail

eagerly to work. If, in developing and dispersing myths and fables, he has not woven a new fable, his services must be appreciated as tending towards a termination, 'devoutly to be wished'—namely, the discovery of a real historical and geographical basis for our knowledge of men and things which have been hidden in clouds and darkness. The object in view is always kept distinct, and pursued with eagerness, we hesitate not to add, with no little success; and it is this assurance, in connexion with the importance of the subject in relation to history, that has induced us to devote a somewhat extended space to the consideration of this volume.

An appendix contains several apt citations from the writings of Oriental scholars. Two valuable and illustrative maps are also given: the one of Affghanistan and the adjacent countries, showing the corresponding settlements of the Hela chiefs or the Hellenes, the Cassiopæi or Cashmirians, the Bhutias (Bud'hists) or Tibetians, the Othryans or Himalayans, the chiefs of the Oxus, Lama tribes, the Philistines, Tartar tribes, &c., in Greece, Palestine, and Egypt; the other of Greece, exhibiting the primitive colonization of the country, from the provinces of the Indus, the Ganges, the Himalayan Mountains, Tibet, Cashmir, and the Oxus.

ART. IV.—*Memoirs of a Literary Veteran.* By R. P. Gillies. In 3 vols. London: R. Bentley. 1851.

2. *The Autobiography of William Jerdan.* Vol. I. London: Arthur Hall and Co. 1852.

WHEN a man sits down in his old age to write the record of his past life, his work must at best be a somewhat melancholy one. There is a pleasure to be derived from the recollection of certain events in which we have been interested, and it is also sometimes pleasant to go back over passages in the history of our past existence with others, but it must be with those who have run a certain length in the race of life with us, or those to whom we feel that the narration has more in it than the eye of mankind generally can perceive. The task of making the public our *confidante* is quite another thing. An autobiography must be something more serious than fireside talk of a winter evening, or it is all but worthless. It must be regarded as a sober duty when once undertaken, and let no one who is in the



very slightest degree sensitive about his own weaknesses, or disposed to deal with himself otherwise than he would with an oyster, ever dream of sitting down to write it. If he has lived to any purpose, and can find no one to whom the value of his existence has suggested the idea of recording it, it is better far that his name be writ on water. He must bear in mind that obscurity is better than scorn, and that once pledged to unbosom himself—pledged to himself to write faithfully the lessons of his career, he must bear down the rising self-love, and with an earnest purpose lay his heart and mind open for the instruction of his fellow men. Anything else than this would be but a mere mockery of himself—a deception which the world in general has shrewdness enough to detect, and is ready enough to expose.

A distinct impression of the responsibility connected with the right discharge of such a duty as that to which we refer, has deterred many from giving to the world the results of their own experiences, than which few books would be more valuable. With equal truth may it be said that a great proportion of our autobiographical literature is amusing, and nothing more. There is nothing of the man's real life to be found in it—nothing of what he knows himself to be, and everything about his friends, all that he remembers about individuals with whom he has dined, or corresponded, or met no matter where; everything, in short, which the writer knows, except himself, obtains due attention, and is read as mere literary gossip may be read—it is not a whit more valuable.

The autobiographies of politicians and literary men are too often of this description. The former, in fact, have scarcely a claim to any other title than that which the editor of a deceased statesman's notes and letters puts upon the volumes he sends to Mr. Murray or Messrs. Longman;—they are merely 'Papers and Letters.' There is really less of the man's life about them than the reports of his speeches in a daily journal contain. In the one case we have a whole phase of his life; in the other, we only get an imperfect glimpse of the phase, which it is of most importance to know. A man of letters, of all others, might, with the necessary amount of courage and self-knowledge, give us by far the most useful autobiography, and it will be generally admitted that the fragments of such works which we do possess are much more interesting, more refreshing, and more instructive, than the bulk of the works to which they are prefixed. While the world has cause to regret that these really valuable contributions to the study of human nature cease just as their value begins to be apparent—just as the writer's self-consciousness is unfolding

itself—it is also to be deplored that the full-length portraits which literary men have given us of themselves are so often painted in a bad light—so lacking in real life-warm colour. One thing is very noticeable about them—viz., the unfavourable impression which they give us of the literary profession. The class of professional literary men has suffered more from the manner in which it has been shown up to the world by individual members of it than by anything that has ever been written or spoken regarding it. The two works before us are written by men who have taken to literature as a profession, who have held honourable and responsible positions as editors of high class periodicals and influential newspapers, and who from certain circumstances, either of a personal kind, or connected with the pursuit of literature, have been left in a much worse position in their old age than that from which they started upon a race in which it is scarcely necessary to say there are both pleasures and prizes for many. If the autobiographies before us have been faithfully written, it is greatly to be deplored that the happiness and the worldly prospects of so many must be sacrificed to the increased and increasing demand for knowledge, and the growing taste for literature. It will scarcely, we think, be doubted that the change which has taken place in the production of books, and the diffusion of knowledge, by whatever medium, within the last half century, has been attended with many beneficial effects to mankind in general. It is quite clear that those who cultivate a taste for letters—who make their literary pursuits the mere occupation of leisure hours—could neither have originated that demand, nor met it with an adequate supply. Are we, then, to conclude that those who, feeling that they were competent to do so, have made it their vocation, must be regarded as having sacrificed themselves for the good of mankind? Few will forget the opinion which Scott gave in the form of an advice: that literature may be both pleasant and useful as a staff, but is after all a sorry crutch. This is a favourite theory with many professional literary men, and especially with those who condescend to be confidential to the public in recording their experiences. It forms the conclusion of all the *jeremiades* about neglect, starvation, unappreciated efforts, and misery; all the charges of heartlessness and dulness which are brought against the world by those who have not succeeded in making fortunes by their labours. Now we have always been very much disposed to question the correctness of the great novelist's figure, so far, at least, as its general application is concerned. The opinion which it conveyed was not, or ought not to have been founded on his experience; for who will be bold enough to say that

Walter Scott, the advocate, or clerk of session, could either have built a princely mansion such as that which the author of 'Waverley' reared by the waters of his own romantic river, or lived in it with the freedom of an ancient border chief, and the expensive tastes of a modern baronet? If literature was a sorry crutch to him, it only became so when he sought to make it something more, and it certainly was strong enough to bear him up bravely and nobly so long as he kept on the path upon which he set out. His difficulties were never the result of his literary avocations, but were greatly modified by his reliance upon these avocations. And when the disastrous effects of his ambition to be something more than that which was his glory, and of commercial speculation combined, came upon him, it was neither the thought of failure in his true career, nor the feeling that his efforts had been unappreciated, that troubled him, but the reflection 'how could I tread my halls with diminished crest?'

We have always been accustomed to regard the fragment of Sir Walter Scott's journal as a model of autobiography. It is so thoroughly truthful and honest, that no one can regard it as other than an expression of the writer's own feelings, set down not for book-making purposes, but in the spirit of a worthy self-examination. How very different is everything about the two works before us. A glance over the headings which Mr. Gillies has given to some of the chapters of his memoirs will enable any reader to see that his case has been that of too many literary men, and that he is much more disposed to lay the blame of his failures upon the unfortunate impulse which led him to make literature a crutch, than upon any lack of energy, or any indiscretion on his part. After a great many more excuses for egotism than are at all necessary in a work which professes to be a record of a man's own experiences, Mr. Gillies gives us the first hint of his contempt for worldly prudence, and the *pensieri stretti* at the close of his first volume; and such words as 'pecuniary embarrassments,' 'pecuniary troubles,' 'renewed misfortunes,' and 'blighted hopes,' appear with very lamentable frequency in the headings to the chapters of the other two. Let us glance at a few of the facts connected with the writer's career as they are stated by himself, with the view of ascertaining whether the things which these distressing words convey have all resulted from a professional connexion with literature, and whether he has been faithful in giving us the real causes for them.

Mr. Gillies, although he never occupied any very prominent position, was once well known in the literary circles of the Scottish metropolis. Left by his father—of whom it is recorded, in the volume before us, that 'he entertained both an aversion



and a contempt for worldly wisdom'—with landed property of considerable extent, connected, too, with families of some note in Scotland, he in very early life obtained the entrée of all the literary and, we may add, high-class convivial circles of Edinburgh forty years ago. Sir Walter Scott he had some title to consider as one of his most intimate friends and valuable advisers. Lord Gillies, the well-known Scottish lawyer, was his father's brother; and he could number among his associates and correspondents most of the literary men, philosophers, and poets of his time, from the celebrated literary nuisance, Lord Buchan, up to such as Playfair, Professor Wilson, Southey, and Wordsworth. If a tendency to outrage the ordinary laws of prudence, and the only ones upon which a man, whatever be his profession, can make progress, or even maintain his position in the world, may be considered hereditary, Mr. R. P. Gillies has at least one plea for his failures. He tells us, with a frankness which we could have wished to see combined with a little less bravado, that he was a very faithful follower of his father's lessons: '*My mistrust and dislike of self-elected saints and church attending people has been very steadfast; and as regards contempt for worldly prudence, I have carried that far beyond the bounds of common sense.*' This is at least candid; but are we to suppose that in the subsequent references to pecuniary matters, Mr. Gillies attributes all or any of his misfortunes to these characteristics? Quite the contrary. He even seems to congratulate himself upon this highminded disregard of what society demands of all its members; and while he does so, of course he by no means stints his abuse of the world in general and those parties in particular to whom he was indebted, or who were enabled to take advantage of his magnanimous contempt for prudential considerations.

A very transparent artifice involved him as security for a loan, and his paternal acres were handed over to the lenders. He shortly afterwards passed as an advocate, but seems to have had no idea of ever practising at the bar. Expensive tastes and rambling habits soon involved him in deeper difficulties, and in almost every instance in which he refers to his personal concerns in the second and third volumes, debt is the theme, and the ingratitude of friends or the hardheartedness of creditors the text for a melancholy digression on the misery of a hand-to-mouth existence.

Ultimately the '*Foreign Quarterly Review*' was projected, and through the interest of Sir Walter Scott and a few others, Mr. Gillies was appointed editor of it. In this capacity he laboured very assiduously, reckoning that he could gain by his own efforts an income of at least £800 a year. These efforts

were afterwards relaxed, however, for he tells us, that instead of attending to his duties as editor, he made repeated and long visits to Edinburgh, for the purpose of raising £1000 or £1500 on the strength of his *prospects*. Difficulties increased and interfered with his duties. 'Instead,' he writes, 'of limiting my family expenses to £400 per annum, which I might then have most easily earned, I gained the renown of being the most persevering and extravagant of spendthrifts. A very long attorney's bill of costs was set down against me to the account of daily turtle, champagne, and the four-in-hand turn out,' (p. 235). He was then thrown into prison, the publishers of the 'Review' failed, his establishment was broken up, his family left in want, and he as well as they homeless. A brief residence in France, fruitless attempts to make financial arrangements out of the little he could earn amid trouble and distress, which might redeem the loss caused by that vaunted contempt for worldly prudence, arrests and imprisonments, such are some of the items in the catalogue of wretchedness with which the last part of Mr. Gillies' book closes. According to his opinion, literary labour could not even be relied on now for the bare necessities of life:—

'Instead of being able to earn £40 per month, as heretofore, I received for papers sent to London only thanks and praise, for the pecuniary recompence was comparatively infinitesimal. The market was said to be overstocked with "copy" in all departments, and what was worse, editors and publishers no longer had money to spare. Railroads occupied the attention of the rich. "Cheap literature" had come into fashion. Penny papers almost supplanted magazines and reviews; and authors who used to gain £500 could scarcely acquire £100 per annum. Through that gloomy month of February we had great anxieties, and a daily struggle for subsistence.'—pp. 292, 293.

And so ends Mr. Gillies' career, begun in what, apart from early training, seemed the most favourable auspices, run in reckless extravagance and most woeful improvidence, and closed as such a career, be it that of merchant, tradesman, or man of letters, must close—in wretchedness and poverty.

Are we, then, to conclude that all this misery is the result of Mr. Gillies' connexion with literature? He would have us to suppose so, for all his confessions of indiscretion and irregularities come in the shape of excuses for getting into difficulties—all his misery is laid at the door of inexorable creditors, who, refusing to make any distinction between an author and a person of any other profession, would not allow him time nor peace to work as he wished to work. There can be no doubt that Mr. Gillies was very often a hard working man; but, by his own confession, he was a lavish spender also; and unfor-

unately he spent much more rapidly than he could work. He neglected or despised the claims made upon him as a member of society, and the father of a family—moral claims which it is more than mere folly to disregard, choosing rather to obey the dictates of selfishness, and a wayward ill-balanced judgment; is it either manly or honest to attribute the result to anything else?

The autobiography of William Jerdan, of which the first volume lies before us, though much better written, is equally pervaded by that spirit of acrimonious raillery, and that tone of melancholy, which characterize the book we have just noticed. Of a piece with the apologies which Mr. Gillies puts forth for the disjointed memoranda of his recollections, and the egotism necessarily involved in his references to pecuniary difficulties, is the excuse which Mr. Jerdan gives us in a postscript, for the errors and the hasty statements that may be found throughout his pages. 'Private circumstances occurred to break hurtfully into his work; and on coming to consult data, which the writer had presumed to be readily found and accessible, he discovered that the materials of from forty to fifty years ago were dissipated, no one knew whither.'

Mr. Jerdan begun his career in circumstances by no means so favourable as those of Mr. Gillies, and he attained a much higher position as a man of letters. Energy, and abilities considerably above the average of men in his sphere, enabled him to ascend rapidly from a merchant's desk in London, and a lawyer's office in Edinburgh, to honourable and responsible situations in connexion with the metropolitan press. In 1813, while he was only in his thirty-first year, he was appointed editor of the 'Sun' when that paper was regarded as an able organ of the government; and in four years after he became responsible editor of the 'Literary Gazette,' a position which he held until 1850. According to his own statements, his connexion with literature could not be unprofitable. During his editorship of one of the journals referred to, he enjoyed an annual salary of £500, with a tenth share of the profits; while as editor and either proprietor or part proprietor of the other, he was by no means ill paid. Notwithstanding all this, he sits down in his old age to chronicle, in bitterness of spirit, a succession of disappointments and difficulties, and looks back through a vista of seventy years upon a life made up of 'uncertain rewards' and broken hopes. The moral of that life, as it is recorded by himself, and according to his estimate of it, is, that the man who adopts literature as a profession must be prepared for all that he has suffered, and for the result which he is now experiencing. If Mr. Jerdan had not recorded a plea against himself in his reference to the profits derived from his literary labours, we



might have adopted his conclusion as a very fair one from the premises, in his allusion to the 'bitter disappointments and uncertain rewards' of a literary life. The contradictory character of the two statements, however, lands us in a difficulty from which we are only extricated by means of a serious homily upon the distress of being in debt, and from an intimation that in very early life Mr. Jerdan 'got his first lesson of that fatal truth, that debt is the greatest curse which can beset the course of a human being.'

This curse seems to have clung to him throughout a great part of his life. This it was, we do not hesitate to say, that put him in the sad position from which he is now looking up, 'with aspirations crushed, from the clouded bottom of the hill' upon 'his early comrades, who, having boldly climbed the summit, range along the height, and in happiness enjoy the brilliant region on which, humanly speaking, warm and eternal sunshine settles.' Leaving the writer to his own idea of the ultimate issue of human effort, and the happiness of those whom he looks up to with such a bitter sense of his own humiliation, let us see who these 'early comrades' are, and why Mr. Jerdan lies at 'the clouded bottom of the hill' while they 'range along the heights.' One of them, Peter Laurie, was a townsman of his own, an apprentice to a saddler, in Kelso; the other, John Pirie, was a native of Dunse, a clerk; and both became in time lord mayors of London. Another early friend is now Sir Frederick Pollock, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and another is Baron Truro, ex-Lord Chancellor. Now, it is obvious enough from the facts of Mr. Jerdan's history, that he was not only a young man of much more promise than any one of these, but his start in life was much more favourable, or might have been so at least, had he followed up his advantages. He admits this much—'My prospects,' he says, 'were apparently as bright as theirs.' 'Why, then, did my friends so nobly succeed, and why did I ultimately so grievously fail?' These are questions, which had the writer put them to himself somewhat earlier, and with an honest desire to shape his future course by the answer, might have rescued him from difficulties at least, if they did not elevate him in his worldly position to the level of his youthful friends. But how does he answer these questions now? Not by any candid confession of his own failings; not by owning that he did not avail himself of the advantages he possessed as a vigorous and well remunerated writer; but by throwing the whole blame upon his connexion with literature. 'I unsteadily forsook the choice of a profession, and within a few years found myself leaning for life on the fragile crutch of literature for my support.' In a previous

chapter, Mr. Jerdan says, in reference to his early connexion with the law,—‘ I never liked the law, and certainly I was not dosed with it.’ He forsook it accordingly, voluntarily adopting a profession in which he was eminently successful for a time, but by which he could not keep himself out of difficulties, just because these difficulties were the necessary result of inattention to what constituted, perhaps, the primary elements of the ultimate success in which his friends repose. Had he adhered to the law, the process which has made him what he is—poor in his old age, would have led to the same result; and had either Sir Peter Laurie or Baron Truro failed to regulate their course by right principles and by their circumstances, considering their early difficulties, they might have been in a much more lamentable condition than that in which Mr. Jerdan now is. A successful professional career in law or literature, or anything else, implies severe labour and steady pertinacity. Conceiving that all the world is as destitute of these as himself, Mr. Jerdan gives us the following bitter, and, as we believe, mistaken counsel :—

‘ And here, again, would I earnestly advise every enthusiastic thinker, every fair scholar, every ambitious author, every inspired poet without independent fortune, to fortify themselves also with a something more worldly to do. A living in the church is not uncongenial with the pursuits of the thinker and scholar, the practice of medicine is not inconsistent with the labours of the author, and the chinking of fees in the law is almost in tuning with the harmony of the poet’s verse. Let no man be bred to literature alone; for, as has been far less truly said of another occupation, it will not be bread to him. Fallacious hopes, bitter disappointments, uncertain rewards, vile impositions, and censure and slander from the oppressors, are their lot, as sure as ever they put pen to paper for publication, or risk their peace of mind on the black, black sea of printer’s ink. With a fortune to sustain, or a profession to stand by, it may still be bad enough; but without the one or the other, it is as foolish as alchemy, as desperate as suicide.’—p. 39.

There is quite enough in the volume from which this is taken to show that it is a fallacious excuse for an ill regulated life. We regret that so much must be said; but truth and the character of the profession to which Mr. Jerdan belongs require that it should be said.

Let us now turn from the unpleasant subject into which the want of sincerity, so observable in autobiographies, has led us, to the more genial task of noticing a few of the livelier topics referred to in the book before us. It is too early to pronounce a decided opinion upon it, perhaps; but judging from the first volume, which contains a great deal of pleasing gossip, we are disposed to consider it one of the best books on literary society

twenty or thirty years ago, which has been published for some time. Its author numbered among his friends many who have earned a high reputation. Thomas Wilde, the late Lord Chancellor as we have already observed, was one of these; and no one will peruse the tribute paid to his indomitable energy without a feeling of high satisfaction. Wilde's prospects in life were by no means such as to make him an object of envy to his literary associate, when the two met on summer Sundays to regale themselves on 'a be-knighted joint of roast beef in the so-called drawing room of a little house at the foot of Highgate Hill.' He was of humble parentage, his father being an attorney in a very limited sphere. But there was an obstacle of a far more formidable kind in the way of his success at the bar—he had an impediment in his speech, which produced a very ludicrous effect whenever he attempted to discourse at any length or with any seriousness. This he set himself to overcome, however, with an amount of energy and perseverance perfectly surprising, and he was ultimately successful. The methods he adopted to resist the annoyance of this defect, and to get rid of it altogether, are thus described. Such instances of self-cure are, we believe, extremely rare.

'He would stand silent till he had composed the organs of sound for the distinct articulation of what he desired to say; and by the skilful and constant application of this inviolable resolution, he, by his own unaided and untaught efforts, conquered the annoying affection. I remember his taking me to some dark office in the Inner Temple-lane, to shew me Bloomfield, the author of "The Farmer's Boy," who, through the interest of Capel Lofft, had been appointed to a situation for some distribution of law forms administered there. The excitement caused a fit of stammering to come on; and there he stood, dumb as a statue, for several minutes, till he had forced his organization, by the effort of will over physical defect, to perform the duty he demanded, and give utterance to well-delivered and well-rounded periods. Such a self-cure is extremely rare, and in this case was nearly perfect; for the only remains that ever appeared in after years, was a slight, occasional, and hardly observable hesitation when pleading at the bar.'—p. 45.

The present Solicitor-General, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, was another of Mr. Jerdan's associates, as well as his younger brother, who, ambitious of histrionic fame, became an actor, and having signally failed, shortly afterwards died 'of an almost broken heart.' Among the smaller celebrities introduced to us there is a curious old man named Proby, whose personal appearance and peculiarities will still be in the recollection of many persons connected with literary life in London. He was a reporter for the 'Morning Chronicle,' and in the early days of reporting sat in the gallery of the House of Lords, and afterwards wrote



reports of the proceedings without taking a single note—depending altogether upon his memory, which was marvellously retentive. Mr. Jerdan gives us a lively sketch of him.

‘Proby had never been out of London, never in a boat, never on the back of a horse. To the end of bag-wigs he wore a bag; he was the last man that walked with a cane as long as himself, ultimately exchanged for an umbrella, which he was never seen without, in wet weather or dry; yet he wrote two or three novels, depicting the social manners of the times! He was a strange feeder, and ruined himself in eating pastry at the confectioners’ shops; he was always in a perspiration, whence George Colman christened him ‘King Porus,’ and he was always so punctual to a minute, that when he arrived in sight of the office window, the hurry used to be,—‘There’s Proby—it is half-past two,’—and yet he never set his watch. If ever it came to right time I cannot tell; but if you asked him what o’clock it was, he would look at it, and calculate something in this sort,—‘I am twenty-six minutes past seven—four, twenty-one from twelve forty—it is just three minutes past three!’ Poor, strange, and simple, yet curiously-informed Proby, his last domicile was the Lambeth parish workhouse, out of which he would come in coarse grey garb, and call upon his friends as freely and unceremoniously as before, to the surprise of servants, who entertain ‘an ‘orrid’ jealousy of paupers, and who could not comprehend why a person so clad was shown in. The last letter I had from him spoke exultingly of his having been chosen to teach the young children in the house their A, B, C, which conferred some extra accommodations upon him, and thanking me for my share in the subscription of a few pounds in the year, which those who knew him in happier days put together to purchase such comforts as his humble situation could admit.’—p. 167.

Mr. Jerdan narrates with great minuteness the assassination of Mr. Percival, of which he was an eye witness, and describes the appearance and conduct of the assassin Bellingham, whom he was the first to lay hands on, with a distinctness and amplitude scarcely necessary at this late day. He had the honour of knowing the victim, however, and that circumstance, taken in connexion with a proximity to him which would have been fatal had the bullet swerved many inches from its course, may account for a lengthened description of a scene which has been so often described. Lord Byron is also mentioned in connexion with a sharp review which appeared in the ‘Sun,’ and which, but for the prudence of Mr. Douglas Kinnaird, would have led to a hostile meeting between its editor and the noble poet. Mr. Jerdan’s connexion with the daily press brought him into contact with persons in almost every grade of life, and he seems to have been by no means chary about some of his acquaintance, who were scarcely so creditable as those we have already mentioned. His tory politics and his position as editor of government newspapers, brought him into frequent association with

Ministers and their parliamentary supporters, while in one instance he made the acquaintance of no less notorious a personage than Mrs. Mary Ann Clarke, at the very time that all London was ringing with the Duke of York's affair, and while the writer himself was, by his own confession, injuriously affecting the circulation of the 'Morning Post' by his remarks upon her. The story of this once celebrated personage is not worth reviving, but the reference to it in the book before us furnishes a curious illustration of the means adopted to gain over those who were disposed to animadvert upon her personal performances with any degree of severity. Mr. Jerdan confesses that his introduction to Mrs. Clarke, and the artillery of 'wheedling,' confidential secrets, allurements, prospects of advantage, *piquant* familiarities, *recherché* treats and lies, brought to bear upon him, had the desired effect to a certain extent. They did induce him to moderate the tone of his strictures. His moral firmness was never strong enough to resist temptations such as these at any time, we are afraid, and if he placed reliance upon the 'prospects of advantage' held out to him in such circumstances, need we wonder that he now writes in such a melancholy strain about the 'fallacious hopes, bitter disappointments, and censure' which fall to the lot of literary men?

With its author's visit to Paris in 1814, when the continent had been opened, the first volume of the autobiography closes. A long appendix follows, in which a poem by Hood is published for the first time. This work, which we do not mean to notice here, is entitled 'Lamia,' the subject being similar to that for which Keats chose the same title. It will add very little to the reputation of the writer, although there are many fine passages to be found in it, and we question its appropriateness at the end of a book like the one before us.

---

ART. V.—*Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England.*

4 vols. Svo.

'THE savage,' says Gibbon, 'who hollows a tree, inserts a sharp stone into a wooden handle, or applies a string to an elastic branch, becomes, in a state of nature, the just proprietor of the canoe, the bow, or the hatchet.' We may add, that in a state of nature, the savage dying, would probably say to one and another around him, 'This is yours, that yours;' and if a scramble ensued, the legatees would have the immense advantage of a claim manifestly reasonable, and be justified in de-

fending their right by the uplifted tomahawk. In civilized society, no such scrambling is allowed; and society must, therefore, in lieu of that right which it takes away, secure to the legatee the sure and peaceful possession of the gifts made to him by the departed. The right to bequeath property is clearly a corollary of the right of property; for he who possesses it may, because it is his own, sell it or give it away. A bequest is simply a dying gift; and a testamentary bequest is that gift sufficiently attested, so that there may be the means of proving the donation, when the donor can no more be questioned concerning it. While, however, the right of property, and the right of the owner to bequeath it, are considered by all intelligent and right-minded men as settled points; the extent of the latter right, or, in other words, the legitimate limits of testamentary bequests, is still an open question, to which we propose to devote a few pages.

'Testaments are of very high antiquity. We find them in use among the ancient Hebrews. . . . Solon was the first legislator that introduced wills into Athens, but in many other parts of Greece they were totally discountenanced. In Rome they were unknown till the laws of the twelve tables were compiled, which first gave the right of bequeathing; and among the northern nations, particularly among the Germans, testaments were not received into use. And this variety may serve to evince, that the right of making wills, and disposing of property after death, is merely a creature of the civil state, which has permitted it in some countries and denied it in others; and even where it is permitted by law, it is subjected to different formalities and restrictions in almost every nation under heaven.'—Bk. ii. c. 32.

Purposely avoiding the minutiae of the subject, we propose to seek an answer to the three following questions:—*Ought man to have the power of bequeathing landed as well as personal property?* Supposing this conceded to him, *Ought he to have the power of bequeathing all his property to whomsoever he will?* And, *Ought society, besides securing the transfer of the property, to undertake to carry out the wishes of the testator, as to the subsequent uses of that property?*

It is often assumed that an essential distinction exists between land and all other commodities, considered as property; so that, while the possessor of a house or a five-pound note holds it by a natural right—always supposing him to have obtained it honestly—the owner of land holds it by the acquiescence of society, rather than by a tenure which will bear rigid scrutiny. We have been amazed at the easy assumption that the foundations on which landed property rests are precarious. There seems to be a rather prevalent opinion, that land belongs to the community in some other sense than other



things do ; and that other kinds of property, houses and carriages, for example, belong to individuals in some sense in which land does not. Probably the more intelligent and honest writers, who are throwing out vague hints to this effect, would recoil with horror from the idea of depriving the present proprietors of the land which they have obtained by heirship or purchase ; but would desire for the future, not only the abrogation of the laws which encourage the accumulation of landed property, but also the enactment of other laws which would prevent such accumulation. If we understand them, they would at least place restrictions on man as the owner of a field which they would not impose on him as the owner of a house or a printing-press.

In one part of the British dominions, where the old Norman laws still prevail, such a distinction between landed and personal property is in force. The owner is permitted to bequeath the latter, but not the former. While he lives, he can give away his land at his pleasure, or sell it, and dispose of the proceeds according to his judgment or his caprice ; but if he die seized of it, the law undertakes its appropriation, dividing it among his children or nearest heirs. The design of this law is, the prevention of the undue enlargement of landed estates ; an object certainly of very high importance in a territory so limited as the Channel islands ; but it does not follow that it is incumbent or wise to compass that object by means of law.

We can, perhaps, conceive of a case in which the well-known rule—*lex suprema salus populi*—would justify this limitation of testamentary bequests ; but the case we submit would be an exceptional one. As a general rule, it is to be condemned, because no necessity has been shown for it ; condemned, therefore, with a thousand other examples of over-governing. Property should, we grant, circulate freely ; like water, if it become stagnant, it becomes mischievous ; but if there be perfect freedom of barter and sale, it will so circulate, as is manifest from the ingenious devices to which the aristocracy of England have recourse in order to keep it stationary. It will be time enough to have laws to force the division of landed property, when it has been found in practice that the necessities and convenience of society are not of themselves sufficient to insure the result desired.

The restriction is objectionable, also, because it is probably sought on the ground of a distinction between landed and other possessions, which cannot be sustained. The land, it is said, is the gift of God ; a house, or a garment, the creation of man. Allowing the distinction, the reader will perceive, that it is not the land as given by God, which the possessor is forbidden to

bequeath, but that land as it has been cultivated by man. The stones and the wood of which a house is built are as truly the gift of God as the soil; but the builder, by shaping and arranging, and cementing them, has given them a value increased a hundred fold. A similar remark applies to the land. Where it exists as God gave it—for example, in the prairies of America or of Australia—no man dreams of a law to compel its division. Legislation aims rather at accumulation. An acre of land in its wild state may be worth half-a-crown. Cultivation and population make it worth a hundred pounds. Why the half-crown should not be given by will is not apparent, and surely it is unreasonable to subject the ninety-nine pounds seventeen and sixpence to such limitation. The Norman law of inheritance, which has been explained, is therefore, we submit, unsound in principle, and a law for which no necessity has been shown.

Taking it, then, for proved, that a limitation of testamentary bequests cannot be based upon varieties in the species of property possessed, *ought man to have the unrestricted power of bequeathing his whole property at his pleasure?*

Among the Romans the power of a father over his children was absolute and perpetual: absolute, for in his father's house the son, in his adult age, was 'a mere thing,' his property being his father's, who could also sell, or punish, or kill him at his pleasure; perpetual, for it terminated only with the death of the father, during whose life the son, though he became consul, remained in the bonds of filial subjection. And though the law was mitigated with the increase of civilization, it continued to the very last, distinguished by singular sternness; for it is affirmed in the Justinian code that there are no other men who have such power over their children as Roman citizens.\* For this stringency in the law in relation to their persons, the Roman youth found a slight compensation in the law of inheritance.

'The jurisprudence of the Romans,' says Gibbon, 'appears to have deviated from the equality of nature, much less than the Jewish, the Athenian, or the English institutions. On the death of a citizen, all his descendants, unless they were already freed from his paternal power, were called to the inheritance of his possessions. The insolent prerogative of primogeniture was unknown; the two sexes were placed on a just level; all the sons and daughters were entitled to an equal portion of the patrimonial estate; and if any of the sons had been intercepted by a premature death, his person was represented, and his share was divided by his surviving children. On the failure of the direct line, the right of succession must diverge to the collateral branches.'

---

\* Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' c. 44.

In the early times of the Roman state, the inheritance was so determined by heirship, and not by will, that a citizen was compelled to show cause for departing from the rule of heirship; and if he had failed to do this, the will was invalid. By the laws of Justinian, neither son nor daughter could be disinherited, excepting for certain crimes, and unless the offence were specified in the will. And further, unless a fourth part of the inheritance were secured to the children, they might appeal from the decision of the father to the judgment of the magistrate, such fourth part, moreover, being payable before the legacies; so that if the estate were not found commensurate with the testament, the deficiency fell upon the legatees, not the heirs.

At Athens, a childless father only could make a will.

And English law has recognised very considerable limitations to testamentary bequests:—

‘By the common law, as it stood in the reign of Henry II., a man’s goods were to be divided into three equal parts, of which one went to his heirs or lineal descendants, another to his wife, and the third was at his own disposal; or if he died without a wife, he might then dispose of one moiety, and the other went to his children; and so *e converso*, if he had no children, the wife was entitled to one moiety, and he might bequeath the other; but, if he died without either wife or issue, the whole was at his own disposal. This continued to be the law of the land at the time of Magna Charta. In the reign of King Edward III., this right of the wife and children was still held to be the universal or common law. Sir Henry Finch lays it down expressly, in the reign of Charles I., to be the general law of the land. But this law is at present altered by imperceptible degrees, and the deceased may now by will bequeath the whole of his goods and chattels, though we cannot trace out when first this alteration began.’—Bk. ii. c. 32.

Our present inquiry is, whether any such limitations as have been described ought to be imposed by law. We will assume that where there is neither wife nor child, a man should be left to do what he will with his own. In the case of a wife, we submit that this power ought to be limited. During her husband’s life she helps to obtain, or assists him in the care and due appropriation of, his property; and has a legal, founded on an obviously natural right to alimony. She is, in truth, a sharer in her husband’s property equitably and legally; and the limitation, therefore, of the husband’s power of bequest, so far as to forbid him to alienate all his possessions from his widow, is not a limitation of the rights of property, but the assertion of them.

In the case of children, it may be argued that the father is the means of bringing them into existence; that if he have property, by means of it he places them, from infancy, in a peculiar posi-



tion in society ; and that he ought not to be allowed to do them the injustice of capriciously leaving them in poverty.

Still we apprehend it were wise to leave the control of the father over his property absolute. As a counterpoise to the supposed claim of the child, it were easy to plead the trouble and expense he has entailed on the parent. By the rule of affection, the children's claim takes precedence of every other ; but *that* rule the law cannot properly pretend to enforce ; and if the plea of equity be put in, it is barred by the considerations already advanced. Indeed, justice and expediency seem alike to condemn the limitation of the father's power of bequest : justice, for if the child have given to him a legal hold on the property of the father, he is, without the consent of the owner, made the proprietor of that which he has not helped to obtain, and of which he may be wholly undeserving ; while the mischievous indiscretion is committed of rendering him independent of his natural governors ; expediency, for in England, where the power of bequest is unlimited, we never hear of the capricious disinheritance of children on behalf of strangers. The intensely strong ties of natural affection, combined with the wish which every man feels to act rightly when he is about to die, afford a sufficient guarantee for the pecuniary interests of children in the testamentary arrangements of their parents, a guarantee unincumbered by the dangers which a legal provision would create.

First ascertaining, then, what share of the husband's possessions can fairly be considered as belonging to the wife, and of which, as he has not the right, he ought not to have the power, to deprive her, there should, we apprehend, be secured to him the absolute power of bequeathing, at his pleasure, every other shilling he may be seized of at the time of his decease.

The third question yet remains. *Ought society, besides securing the transfer of the property, to undertake to carry out the wishes of the testator as to the subsequent uses of that property ?*

'By the Roman law,' says Gibbon, 'the power of the testator expired with the acceptance of the testament, each Roman of mature age and discretion acquiring the absolute dominion of his inheritance ; and the simplicity of the civil law was never clouded by the long and intricate entails which confine the happiness and freedom of unborn generations.' English law adopts the very opposite principle. It allows a testator to affix almost any project to the property he is leaving behind him, and undertakes to render the property the means of carrying out such project in perpetuity. Is this right ? We apprehend not, and that the Roman principle is the sound one.

The present state of English law is obviously inconsistent.

It will not ensure to man the fulfilment of any wish he may have as to the appropriation of his property, but only of such wish as the state may deem legitimate. If the purpose be in the judgment of the state immoral, though the donor should have deemed it most sacred, the bequest is void; and it has been ruled that a will may be set aside on the ground of absurdity. Either the state has not gone far enough, or it has gone too far. If it assume to judge in some cases whether the bequest is for the good of society, it should exercise such judgment in all cases; if not in all, then in none. If it is to enter on this sphere of moral judgment, it should compass it; if it do not compass, it should not touch, it. The endowment of all religious sects is the logical sequence of the position in which the English government now stands in relation to national endowments: the office of judge of the utility of all wills, the logical sequence of its present position in relation to testamentary bequests. The dictate of truth in both cases is, neither to stand still nor to advance, but to undo that which has been done. At present, if a wealthy man leave ten thousand pounds for the spread of socinianism, the state undertakes to use that sum for that purpose; but if it be bequeathed for the promulgation of atheism, the state refuses to execute the trust. We submit that it would be wise in the state to escape from this and similar inconsistencies by declining all trusteeship, and undertaking only to insure the transfer of the property with all its powers, from the deceased to the donee.

Especially as, by the existing system, the community suffers itself to be fettered by limitations to which the individuals composing that community would scorn to submit. They who leave property by will, seldom permit the first testament to be final. Their opinions change, their circumstances also, and the circumstances of those around them. Man is far from possessing infallibility in his judgment of the present, and to prescience he can make no pretension. Were a testator to live ten years longer than he does, it is highly probable that what proves to be his last will, would not be the last; and if therefore society will accept at the hands of a dying man the power of appropriating his property, it ought to possess the correlative power which the owner would never have surrendered, of changing its appropriation. No wise man, at the age of thirty, would so tie up his property that without extreme difficulty he could not in after life alter the use of it. He would say 'No! I wish to have the power of using it according to changes which may arise, but which I cannot foresee.' Why should society subject itself to the bondage which the individual would not endure?



We object, further, to the English power of entailing property, as a robbery of the existing generation. The earth and its increase God has given to the children of men—that is, to the living generation. Why should the present race suffer its heritage to be curtailed by the intermeddling of the dead? Let man during his mortal existence plant or pluck up, build or pull down, buy or sell; but why is he, who has been in his grave a century, to determine for what purpose the land shall yield its increase, and the house its rental? We respect the memory of the dead, but we do not think it is their province to have the control of our gold and our fields. Manifestly, if the principle were carried out to its full extent, the existing generation, the gods of the scene, would have no power at all: the dominion conferred by the Creator would be lost, and they would be reduced to mere stewards of the dead. The true lords of the soil would be those who had taken bodily possession of it by descending to the grave, and all the living would be but tenants at their will. We deny the right of the dead to determine the expenditure of a single halfpenny.

A vicious principle brings its own punishment, and so works out its own cure; and there is some hope that Englishmen will at length be driven to abandon their present testamentary system, by the difficulties in which it involves them; for these are many and great, and they arise from the law of bequest, both directly and indirectly. Indeed, it would be both difficult and tedious to trace out the various modes in which the substitution of the Roman for the English law of inheritance would simplify our national movements, exchanging the labyrinths we are now doomed to thread, for straight paths. A few of the more salient points only can we attempt to indicate.

Every community will be naturally desirous that no laws should be enacted which would retard the physical improvement of its territory. And though a government cannot intermeddle with a proprietor so long as he does not injure his neighbour, albeit he should wholly mismanage his estate, because the interference would involve greater evils than it would remedy, it cannot be wise in a government to undertake to execute the schemes of the dead, if it can be shown that these directly tend to a waste of property, and the obstruction of improvement. Now, it is notorious that trustees have, as compared with owners, but a slight interest in the management of estates, and by that power of devising we are now calling in question, a very large amount of property is continually kept under such careless guardianship. Look to the leased estates of the church, to the reports of the commissioners of charities, to collegiate estates, to property in general held on similar con-



ditions, and what can be more manifest than the great public waste incurred? The land so held is the last to exhibit agricultural improvements; cities existing under this tenure always appear as in a state of dotage; if a house in a street be half a century out of date, the phenomenon is fully explained when we are told that it is an endowment: and thus does the nation pay a well-deserved penalty for intermeddling with matters that belong not to it.

The want of simplicity in English law, and its unsearchable involutions, are a standing reproach. All admit the evil, yet where the gigantic industry to work the cure is to be found no one knows. The most inscrutable of these cycles and epicycles are generated by the law of entail. 'It is the landed property of the gentry, with its long and voluminous train of descents and conveyances, settlements, entails, and incumbrances, that forms the most intricate and most extensive object of legal knowledge.'—(Intro. sec. I.) Regard the earth as the centre of the universe, and our astronomical theory must be complex in the extreme. Regard the sun as the centre of the solar system, and the theory is at once and fully simplified. Let property be left to its natural course of descent, and our laws to secure its transmission need be but few, and those of the plainest kind. You have to legislate only for existing facts. But if you are to legislate for all futurity, with all its contingencies, the laws must of necessity be past finding out.

The main reason why the English law of bequest is valued, is its obvious adaptation to perpetuate the families, or rather the titles, of the nobility. Their estates are entailed, and in almost every imaginable way. A rich man, for example, may choose to settle two vast estates on his son, with this condition annexed: that one of them shall be held for ever in *tail male*, and the other in *tail female*. We can suppose that son to have an only child, a daughter; and that daughter to have an only child, a son. This son, the great-grandson and only lineal descendant of the testator, can inherit neither of the estates, but they must pass away from him to other heirs, however remote. He loses one of them because his mother had the misfortune to be a woman, and the other because he has the misfortune to be a man. And if this should be treated as an hypothesis only, it is certain that startling and distressing exemplifications of the working of our testamentary system are frequently arising. Thus the late Earl of Montague had most extensive possessions, and a large family, who were, however, all guilty of the crime of being daughters, and were therefore all disinherited by the decision, not of their father, but of some ancestor or ancestors whom neither they nor he ever saw. The inhuman inequality

thus introduced into families, the miserable position of daughters and younger sons, and the expense thrown upon the country of maintaining, by a vast system of sinecures, a large proportion of these foundlings, may well lead us to suspect that the system of entail itself is essentially vicious. Men do not gather thistles from the fig-tree, nor briers from the vine.

The perpetuity of possession and appropriation at which English law now aims is generally defeated by the very means it employs to secure its purpose. Is the object of man to build up his family? He succeeds only in building up one member of a family, by doing injustice to all the other members in each successive generation; and the one member who becomes the heir, ceases generally at no distant time to be the offspring of the testator. By the failure of issue, or the accident of daughters, the inheritance passes to strangers. His own family, if it do not become extinct, is blended in the general mass of society, and overshadowed and oppressed by means of the entails he creates. Is an estate bequeathed to endow in perpetuity, not a name, but an opinion; not a title, but a sect? It seems to be the peculiar misfortune of such a bequest to embalm the opinion if it be erroneous, and to suck out its very life-blood if it be true. Take away the glebes and rent-charges, and the Episcopalians of England would at once soar from the degradation of a worldly corporation into the majesty and life of the Christian kingdom. Relieve many a dissenting congregation of the mistaken bounty which has endowed it, and it would exchange the corruption and inertness of pauperism for the vigour and health of self-dependence. And if in some cases the endowments do not appear to be only evil, but to serve some useful purpose, yet are they ever subject to a special liability to abuse; while in these cases of seeming utility they would probably be needless but for the existence of some kindred and contiguous mischief. A Christian church is, by such artificial aid, sustained in a village, where, without that support, it must be dissolved. But were there no state-church in that village, it would probably contain, as it ought, but one church, and that self-supporting; and if otherwise, the inhabitants being so schismatical that they could not be content with one church, it surely would not be desirable to nurse that spirit of schism by endowments.

We reach, then, the conclusion, that it is wise and expedient that Government should ensure the transfer of property according to the will of the testator, but should peremptorily decline to be responsible for its appropriation. If men wish to build an hospital, or a meeting-house, or a club-house, let them do so, and leave to their successors all the powers they themselves

possess; or, to quote again the sentiment of Gibbon, let the power of the testator expire with the acceptance of the testament, each Briton of mature age and discretion acquiring the absolute dominion of his inheritance; and let not the simplicity of law be clouded by the long and intricate entails which confine the happiness and freedom of unborn generations.

ART. VI.—1. *The Grenville Papers; being the Correspondence of Richard Grenville, Earl Temple, K.G., and the Right Hon. George Grenville, their Friends and Contemporaries.* Now first published from the original MSS. formerly preserved at Stowe. Edited with Notes, by William James Smith, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. London: John Murray.

2. *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham and his Contemporaries.* With original Letters and Documents, now first published. By George Thomas, Earl of Albemarle. In two volumes, 8vo. London: Richard Bentley.

UNTIL recently, our historical literature of the last century has been very scanty and incomplete. Even intelligent men have known little of what occurred from 1688 to the breaking-out of the first French revolution. A few names are familiar to English ears; but, for the most part, the interval which elapsed from the accession of the house of Hanover to the period we have named, has been devoid of personal interest, unoccupied either by men or incidents capable of awakening enthusiasm, or of perpetuating their memory. The intrigues and unscrupulous ambition of Bolingbroke, the administrative talents and corrupting policy of Walpole, the worn-out cliqueship of the great whig houses, the effete officialism of Newcastle, the imperious and haughty dictatorship of Chatham, the servility of Bute, the courtly sycophancy of 'the king's friends,' the unpopularity of the first and second George, and the stolid obstinacy and despotic temper of the third, lie on the surface of our history, and are known, though vaguely and with much misapprehension, by all well-read Englishmen. These are the prominent objects on the political canvas, and even their features are but imperfectly sketched. Of the remainder scarcely anything is known. Their very features are distorted; they appear only in groups, and fail, in consequence, to produce any permanent individual impression.



The same remark holds good in reference to the more important transactions of the period. In illustration, we may adduce the revolt of the North American colonies. It is only of late that the origin, grounds, and course of this momentous event are beginning to be known. Even yet there is much to be learned respecting it. Immediately before the French revolution, it was lost sight of amid the greater turbulence and more terrible incidents of that tragedy. This may account, in part, but it does not account wholly, for the apathy with which the American struggle has been regarded. The period in question, with brief and fitful exceptions, is remembered with humiliation and shame. It was a season of 'dwarfish talents and gigantic vices, in which political delinquency reached its lowest depth, in which patriotism was but a name, self and power the stimulants of ambition, and mediocrity of talent, coupled with party passion, sullied our national honor, and endangered our very liberties. No wonder, therefore, that our countrymen turn from it with disgust. What they know of the men and the occurrences of that day is deeply mortifying to their pride, and they may well plead, to be excused from a closer and more scrutinizing glance. Where the little they do know is so repulsive and humiliating, it is no marvel that they decline the labor required in order to a more intimate acquaintance. And yet it is not wise to yield to this impulse. There is much to be learned from the period in question. If it does not furnish many examples it holds out ample warnings. It shows, at least, what statesmen and politics may become when not controlled by a healthful popular influence, and thus deepens the conviction which every page of our history produces, that there is no security for freedom, no effectual guard against corruption and tyranny, but in the intelligence, virtue, and political activity of the people.

It is a hopeful sign, and one in which we much rejoice, that the materials for an enlightened estimate of this period have been recently greatly increased. The Walpole, Chatham, Burke, and Bedford Correspondence, with several Biographies, and the volumes now before us, have cleared up many difficulties which were previously impenetrable, and have set in a just light the character both of actions and of men, about which much misapprehension had existed. It is not, perhaps, too much to say, that on some points we are more competent to form an impartial and sound judgment than even the contemporaries of the men to whom we refer. This advantage is gained at some cost, yet we estimate the former so highly that we are quite willing to pay the latter. The *Correspondence* which has been given to the world, while containing much that is valuable, contains also

much that is worthless or trifling. There is chaff mixed with the wheat; and he who wishes to possess the wheat must be content to examine thoroughly and sift the chaff. The 'Grenville Correspondence' illustrates what we mean. It is not easy to over-estimate its value, yet a considerable part of it might have been withheld without any loss to our historical literature. Very many of the letters have no historical worth whatever, nor is it easy to divine the object for which they are printed. They only serve to swell the collection, augmenting its bulk, without adding to its value; thus increasing the labor of the inquirer, and in some cases, it may be, concealing what he is most intent on ascertaining. As the inevitable consequence of this want of due selection, the *Correspondence* is to be extended to four volumes, only two of which are yet before us. Had a more rigid rule been adopted, two volumes would have been amply sufficient, and many readers would thus have been secured who are now lost by the bulk and expensiveness of the work. This is an evil against which future editors should carefully guard. Family vanity may be gratified by displaying the extent and variety of the correspondence which their great men have carried on; but this is a poor ambition, and is far outweighed by the injury done to the interests of the many.

We have classed together the two publications named at the head of this article, from the fact of their relating to the same period of our history, and having to do, for the most part, with the same personages. The 'Grenville Correspondence' commences earlier than the 'Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham,' and is further distinguished from it by being simply a collection of letters and other papers. The *Memoirs* make much use of original documents, but these are judiciously interwoven into a continuous narrative, of which the *Correspondence* is wholly destitute. The former, therefore, is the most readable book, and is adapted for the many, while the other is suited only to the few. The one will be perused with pleasure by all intelligent Englishmen, while the other will be prized by historical inquirers only. Both works are illustrated by a large body of foot-notes, in which interesting and valuable information is given on multifarious topics. We shall be glad to find that the example of the Earl of Albemarle is followed by the future editors of family papers. No works are less attractive than those which consist of a bare collection of letters; while few have greater claims on public attention, or more richly reward it, than those which present such letters as parts of a connected narrative.

The 'Grenville Correspondence' consists principally of letters to and from Richard Grenville, Earl Temple, and his brother, the Right Hon. George Grenville. The former was born September 26th, 1711, and the latter October 14th, 1712. Lord Temple was successively First Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord Privy Seal, under the administration of the elder Pitt, formed in November 1756. Pitt, it will be remembered, married Lady Hester Grenville, after which her brother, Lord Temple, was 'his most intimate and affectionate friend.' The *Correspondence* contains some beautiful letters, to which we shall presently advert, pertaining to this marriage. He resigned office with Mr. Pitt in 1761, and became a zealous leader of opposition, both to Lord Bute's cabinet, and to that which was subsequently formed under the premiership of George Grenville. He was reconciled to his brother in 1765, but, as we had occasion to show in a former article,\* broke with Mr. Pitt in the following year. Their alienation lasted till the autumn of 1768, after which they acted together to the close of life. George Grenville filled various public offices from 1744 to 1765. He did not resign with his brother and Mr. Pitt in 1761, but retained office under Lord Bute, and, on the resignation of 'the favourite' in April 1763, he was appointed First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer. This brief glance at the history of the two brothers is needful to a clear understanding of the *Correspondence* before us.

It is painful to remark throughout this collection—in its earlier as well as its later periods—the evidence furnished of the terrible bodily sufferings of Pitt. The malady which clouded his latter days, and for a time obscured the light of his genius, is frequently referred to, in terms which betokened its fearful severity. It must suffice to give one example. Writing from Bath, March 6th, 1754, he says,—'I am myself still suffering much pain, under the third attack of the gout in both feet. I am, indeed, much out of order, and worn down with pain and confinement: this gout which I trusted to relieve me has almost subdued me: I am the horse in the fable, *non equitem dorso, non frænum depulit ore*. I must, however, endeavour to look forward to ease and health in reversion, and support myself as I can.'

On the following day he reported to the Grenvilles the death of Mr. Pelham, respecting whom he remarks,—'I am sensibly touched with his loss, as of a man, upon the whole, of a most amiable composition: his loss as a minister is utterly irreparable, in such circumstances as constitute the present dangerous

---

\* March, 1852. Art. VI.



conjuncture for this country, both at home and abroad.' Pitt differed on this occasion from some of his associates. They were inclined to secede from the government, of which Pelham had been the head; but 'the great commoner,' contrary to his usual policy, counselled moderation, and his advice was taken. Writing to Lord Temple, March 24, 1754, he says:—

'I am still more strongly fixed in my judgment from the state of things as it opens, and will open every day, that the place of importance is employment, in the present unsettled conjuncture. It may not to us be the place of dignity, but sure I am it is that of the former. I see, as your lordship does, the treatment we have had: I feel it as deeply, but I believe, not so warmly. I don't suffer my feelings to warp the only plan I can form that has any tendency or meaning; for making ourselves felt, by disturbing government, I think would prove hurtful to the public, not reputable to ourselves, and beneficial in the end, only to others. All Achilles as you are, Impiger, Iracundus, &c., what would avail us to sail back a few myrmidons to Thessaly! Go over to the Trojans, to be revenged, we none of us can bear the thought of. What then remains? The conduct of the much-enduring man, who by temper, patience, and persevering prudence, became *adversis rerum immersabilis undis*.'—Grenville Papers, vol. i. p. 116.

In the autumn of 1754, Mr. Pitt made proposals of marriage to Lady Hester Grenville, which were cordially approved by her brother, Lord Temple.—'You sent me from Stowe,' he says, 'the most blessed of men, and every hour I live only brings me new and touching instances of the unceasing goodness and most affectionate and endearing partiality towards me, of the kind, noble, and generous fraternity to which it is my glory and happiness to be raised.' The language of Lady Hester was equally grateful. Writing to her brother, she says,—'I have millions of thanks to offer you for your love to him, to me, and for those expressions of affection and regard which give me a double joy, as they will recommend me further to your friend, to whom I wish to be recommended by every endearing circumstance, feeling that pride and pleasure in his partiality for me which his infinite worth not only justifies, but renders right.'

Lord Temple's professions in this matter were not idle. They were well sustained, as the following brief letter shows. Pitt's circumstances were never affluent. Temple knew this, and with a generous promptitude and delicacy, for which we can pardon him many faults, he wrote Lady Hester on the 20th of November 1755:—

'I cannot defer till to-morrow morning making a request to you, upon the success of which I have so entirely set my heart, that I flatter myself you will not refuse it me. I must entreat you to make use of all your interest with Mr. Pitt to give his brother Temple leave to become his

debtor for a thousand pounds a year 'till better times: Mr. P. will never have it in his power to confer so great an obligation upon, dear Lady Hester, your most truly affectionate brother.'—*Ib.* p. 149.

The proffer was accepted with a cordiality which warms the heart:—'Judge,' said Lady Hester in reply, 'if you can, how my heart is affected by being, not the sharer only, but the means, of your proving in so noble a manner your affection for a person dearer to me than myself. You make me the happiest woman in the world, so that, to avoid ingratitude, I must forgive your having laid me under an obligation to those who, in turning us out, have furnished the occasion of so much joy to me.'

The correspondence was honorable to all parties, and affords an explanation for—what otherwise is unaccountable—the tenacity with which Mr. Pitt clung to the political companionship of Lord Temple, to the serious detriment of his own interests. Again and again he declined office, because Temple refused to join him; and it was only when the necessity of the case precluded further refusal that he acceded to the overtures of the Crown. The readers of this period of our history need not be informed of the severe censures he incurred for deferring so long to the views of his brother-in-law.

George III. succeeded his grandfather in 1760, and immediately commenced the policy which he had been taught by his mother, the Princess Dowager of Wales, and by his governor, the Earl of Bute. Neither of these personages was fitted to train the mind of an English monarch. The views of the former were founded on the despotic sovereignty of a petty German court, in which she had been brought up, while those of the latter betokened an intriguing and arbitrary mind, inexperienced in state affairs, and far more concerned to maintain his sway over a youthful monarch, than to consult the welfare of a nation. 'George, be king,' were the inauspicious words which his mother incessantly whispered into the ear of her son. His father's residence, known as Leicester House, had been the centre of disaffection to the Government of George II.; and when at length the time of his own sovereignty arrived, he showed himself an adept in the learning taught him. From the accession of the House of Hanover, the whigs had been in power. Having secured the rights of the reigning dynasty against the treasonable machinations of the tory party, they were naturally rewarded with the confidence of the Crown. A long possession of office, however, had materially impaired their patriotism. They merged their more illustrious character in that of the placeman; and at length assumed to divide

amongst themselves the emoluments of office, as their undoubted right. Had George III., in opposing their pretensions, shown that he was influenced by a regard to his people, he would have entitled himself to our gratitude. But such was not the case. It was quite clear that his policy was selfish and arbitrary. It was founded on the maternal instructions he had received, and was designed rather to establish his own supremacy, than to secure to his people the benefits of a large and tolerant policy. At an earlier period, and under more favorable circumstances, he would have vied with Charles I. in maintaining the royal prerogative. We feel, therefore, no gratitude, as we are not sensible of any benefits.

At the time of his accession, William Pitt was minister, and never, probably, had the fortunes of England been more nobly redeemed than by this prince of statesmen. His temper, however, was too unyielding, his genius too self-reliant, to suit the policy of George III. It was nothing that he had retrieved the fading honors of his country, that he had raised England from debasement to a pinnacle of transcendent glory, that he had infused vigor into all departments of the public service, and had commanded for himself and his country the respect of other powers. His very successes were a crime. The triumph of his policy was his great fault. Before his commanding genius, the limited intellects of the monarch and of his favorite stood abashed; and it was therefore resolved to take advantage of the Spanish question to drive Pitt from office. The intrigue succeeded, and we need not say how rapidly England sunk from her proud position. The patriot was exchanged for the courtier. Pitt retired, and Bute became virtually prime minister in October, 1761. This had been foreseen from the commencement of the new reign, and might have been foretold from the circumstances mentioned by the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Hardwicke, in his letter of October 26th, 1760. The scheme ripened rapidly. 'The king,' says the same restless intriguer, in the following September, 'seems every day more offended with Mr. Pitt, and plainly wants to get rid of him at all events.' This object was at length effected, and the little men who succeeded glorified themselves on the attainment of their end.

'The cause,' wrote Lord Temple, 'of his quitting the ministry was from a difference of opinion in a capital measure relative to Spain, as you know; the favourite united with the minister of numbers, bore down the minister of measures, and by that means in effect removed him from the king's council, and deprived him of the means of further serving the public. A time will come, I trust, when these matters will be fully explained to both Houses of Parliament.'—*Ib.* p. 404.



On quitting office, Pitt was induced to accept the barony of Chatham for his wife, and an annuity of £3000 during three lives for himself. That he deserved these rewards is undoubted. He had rendered signal services to his country, and might rightly claim what was so lavishly conferred on men far less meritorious. His resources were, moreover, very limited, while his devoted attachment to Lady Chatham and his children must have disposed him to rejoice in placing them beyond the reach of pecuniary anxiety.\* Nevertheless, the wisdom of his course in this matter is open to grave question. His whole strength was popular. He was the man of the people, and his influence rested entirely on their faith in his independence and disinterestedness. Whatever affected this was fatal to his power. It was the basis on which he stood, which had enabled him successfully to contend against the whig aristocracy and the tory faction, nay, which had upheld him against courtly intrigues, and the ill-concealed aversion of royalty itself. The policy of the king was sufficiently apparent. No one suspected him of attachment to Pitt, and a generous appreciation of the great merits of his retiring minister was not in the nature of the monarch. To destroy the reputation of that minister was, we believe, the policy of the king. If the patriot could be turned into the pensioner, it was hoped to deprive Pitt of the popular support which had hitherto rendered him formidable. Such was the low-minded and unworthy design with which the royal favors were conferred; and for a time Pitt was duped. It would, perhaps, be asking too much, that he should have declined to accept for those he loved so tenderly, the honor and the provision that were proffered; but we do wish he had been less profuse in his expressions of gratitude—less obsequious and courtier-like in his mode of accepting them. Self-respect, a sense of what was due to his great services, ought to have kept him from the servile and adulatory style in which he acknowledged the hollow favors of his sovereign. His delusion, however, could not be long maintained, for the same 'Gazette' which announced his retirement from office, reported also his acceptance of the peerage and pension. The announcement produced its expected effect. 'The city and the people,' wrote Rigby, 'are outrageous about Lady *Cheat'em*, as they call her, and her husband's pension.' This resentment, however, was short-lived. Pitt vindicated

\* 'When Lord Bute,' it is remarked in a memorandum preserved in Mrs. Grenville's handwriting, 'told Mr. Grenville of Mr. Pitt's resignation, Mr. Grenville mentioned what he apprehended to be the distressed state of his private affairs, and as much as possible forwarded Lord Bute's disposition to recommend to the king to give him a mark of favour.'

himself in a letter to his friend, Alderman Beckford, which was printed in the 'Public Ledger,' and the good sense of the people speedily did him justice. On the 20th of October, the Duke of Newcastle reported to the Earl of Hardwicke, 'that Mr. Pitt's letter had brought back all his old friends to him; that there was to be a meeting of the Common Council to instruct his Majesty in the most violent manner to support war and warlike measures; with some compliments to Mr. Pitt.'

Of the writer of this report it is difficult to speak in moderate terms. His long tenure of office kept him before the public nearly half a century, and his weak points were so obvious as to be noted by men of all parties, and generally, in terms of severe reprobation. Few statesmen have been sketched by so many unfriendly pens, nor is it possible, after an interval of many years, to cherish respect for his memory, or to dwell with satisfaction on his career. The Earl of Albemarle does his best to mitigate judgment on his behalf; but the utmost that even an apologist can plead is contained in the following sketch:—

'He was, in fact, the butt against which contemporary ridicule levelled all its shafts. That he was fretful, busy, intriguing, unmethodical, and self-sufficient; that his demeanour lacked dignity, and that he mistook expedients for principles, cannot be denied; indeed his numerous unpublished letters, to which I have had access, rather corroborate than weaken the fidelity with which these traits have been delineated. But his contemporaries would see only the superficial and ridiculous points of Newcastle's character. They would not do justice to his many sterling good qualities. He was courteous, affable, accessible, humane, a warm friend, a placable enemy. His talents were not sufficiently appreciated. They were far above mediocrity. It was his want of method that made them not more generally available. He both spoke and wrote with ability and readiness. Upon his private life rested no stain, and in an age of political immorality he was one of the most personally disinterested men of his day. He understood clearly our relations with the continental states. His views of civil and religious freedom were in advance of his age, and he acted on them whenever his fears, his jealousies, or his ambition—a most comprehensive exception indeed—permitted his opinions to affect his conduct. His faults were obvious; he clung indecorously to place and power. But it does not appear that either its emoluments or even honours were the real attractions of office. Newcastle, like the Sergeant-at-Law in Chaucer's tale, had a morbid appetite for employment:—

"No whar so besy a man as he thar n'as,  
And yet he seemyd besier than he was."

'To this restless craving for occupation, may be ascribed the duke's officious intermeddling with the departments of his colleagues, and his querulous jealousy of the least interference with that over which he himself presided. Like an enthusiastic chess-player, he would eagerly direct

another's moves, while he would hardly endure even a looker-on at his own game. — 'Memoirs,' Vol. i. pp. 11-13.

It was the policy of Bute gradually to drive the former ministers from office. He had succeeded in the case of Pitt, the most formidable of them all, and it was not long before Newcastle saw that his own fate was predetermined. He had permitted himself to be played off against his colleague, and had doubtless imagined that his own influence in the cabinet would be strengthened by the absence of the great commoner. His vanity was gratified by the supposition, but he soon learnt his error. So long as there was fear of Pitt, Newcastle was courted; but when once the former had retired, the latter perceived himself to be a cipher, laughed at and insulted by those whose counsels he expected to influence, if not direct. His complaints were frequent and loud. He wrote and spoke with the bitterness of a disappointed man; but his complaints excite no indignation, as his patriotic professions awaken no confidence. He deserved the treatment he received, and his career may serve as a warning to vain and unscrupulous intermeddlers in all coming times. Many of his letters are printed by Lord Albemarle, and they are all more or less characteristic. Lord Bute is termed the *sole dictator*, and important decisions are alleged to have been arrived at without the cognizance of the Duke. 'Was ever man in my station,' he asks, 'or infinitely less, treated with so much slight and contempt?' The indignities now received called up with complacency the memory of days, of which he formally complained. Writing to Lord Hardwicke, December 30th, 1761, he says, 'Even Mr. Pitt, till towards the last, always paid that attention to me (and I believe to your lordship) as constantly to send me his draughts, with copies for my own use, desiring me to make such alterations as I should think proper, before he produced them at the meeting of the king's servants. These ministers act in a very different way.'

It was soon obvious to the veteran intriguer that there was an *imperium in imperio*, an inner cabinet, to the consultations and resolves of which he was a stranger. This was gall and wormwood to his vanity and ambition, and his querulous complainings were poured into the ears of his correspondents and friends. These things could not but be known. They were probably reported to Bute with exaggerations, and the crisis, which every one foresaw, was thus accelerated. At length, on the 10th of May, 1762, Newcastle informed Lord Hardwicke that he had made a discovery 'tending to prove the resolution taken by my Lord Bute to force me out immediately. The



king,' he adds, 'who was very gracious the other day, said not one word to me upon my own subject—a proof the party is taken.' Had the duke possessed a tithe of the spirit which became his rank and office, he would have held his opponents at bay, by spurning the semblance of power when deprived of its reality. Such, however, was not his nature; and hence the pitiful complaining of the following letter to the Marquis of Rockingham, dated May 19th:—

' . . . . I was this day at Court. His Majesty was barely civil; would not do a very right thing in the post-office at the recommendation of my Lord Bessboro' and Mr. Hampden. I desired the king's leave to attend his Majesty some day next week to settle my *private account*, and that I hoped his Majesty would allow me to retire from my employment a day or two after the Parliament rose. His Majesty asked me, whether I should go to Claremont. I said, 'Yes; I might afterwards go to other places.' The king did not drop one word of concern at my leaving him, nor even made me a polite compliment, after near fifty years' service, and devotion to the interest of his royal family. I will say nothing more of myself, but that I believe never *any man* was so dismissed. But all this puts me the more in the right. C—— told the Duke of Devonshire that the resolution was taken not to *ask* me to stay.'—Ib. pp. 111, 112.

The Court was not satisfied with the retirement of Newcastle. A thorough clearing was resolved on, and the prerogative was, therefore, stretched beyond anything which had been known since the Revolution. 'It is believed, and given out, wrote Lady Temple to her husband, Dec. 17th, 1762, 'that, even to a hundredth cousin of those that have not behaved well are to march out of the most trifling places.' Henry Fox, the first Lord Holland, was prominent in these proceedings. Lord Bute sought to avoid the odium they created, but his policy was sufficiently obvious, and his duplicity, therefore, availed him little. 'As to one set of men,' said the Duke of Devonshire to the Marquis of Rockingham, Dec. 26th, 1762, 'endeavouring to throw it upon the other, I look upon it as mere artifice, for measures of this kind cannot be done but in concert, and therefore I pay no regard to what they say on the subject, and only wish the time was come to retaliate upon them, and that they may have ample justice done them.'

Fox and Bute persisted in their policy, and the Duke of Newcastle consequently wrote, on the 24th of January, to Lord Hardwicke:—

'I send your lordship the most cruel and inhuman list that was ever seen, not only in a free country, nor even in any civilized nation. This list, as I understand, was sent to the Custom-House on Saturday last, and yet, cruel as it is, we are told it is only their *first fire*, and that we are to have a *second*; and what favours that opinion is, that they seem hitherto to have gone through only the Port of London, and the poor unhappy

county of Sussex. Their brutality and inhumanity may have satisfied, in some measure, their revenge. But if they meant by it to promote their interests in our county, I can assure them it will have a quite different effect. . . . There is not one single man turned out, against whom the slightest complaint can be made, in the execution of their office. Most of them were excellent officers. I find several of my friends are determined to mention these cruelties in their speeches in the House of Commons.—Ib. pp. 158, 159.

That Henry Fox should have lent himself to any measures by which wealth and power were promised is not surprising; but that his sagacity should have been so at fault, as to permit the supposition of such wholesale proscription being serviceable to his interests, is, indeed, marvellous. He was an able but unscrupulous man, combining many of the worst qualities which in other times would have made him a dangerous minister. Of honesty he knew nothing; expediency was his rule; the *present* was the time for which he acted, and the judgment of posterity he either overlooked or despised. His recklessness made him a fitting tool for Bute, and commended him to the temporary favor of George III. Happily, events were approaching which called for another order of statesmen, and summoned into political life an element which had been too long banished from the national councils.

The continuance of many whigs in office after the retirement of Pitt, Newcastle, and others, cannot be reconciled with integrity. Burke, in his 'Thoughts on the Present Discontents,' has done his best to vindicate their policy, but the defence is unavailing. The fact admits of one explanation only, and that is far from creditable. The truth is, that faction had supplanted principle, and selfishness had eaten out the heart and soul of political ambition. Long possession of office had corrupted the whigs, who were broken-up into several cliques; and Jacobins, converted into rampant tories, were ready to sacrifice both constitution and liberty for a share of the spoils which the monarch bestowed. It would be difficult to fix on a period of our history when public virtue was at a lower ebb. We have had seasons of more gigantic crimes—the days, for instance, of Henry VIII., of Strafford, of the popish and Rye-House plots, and of the western campaign—but we look to our annals in vain, for any such collapse as had befallen the great body of our statesmen at the period of which we write.

On the Duke of Newcastle's resignation, Lord Bute became premier, and Mr. Grenville secretary of state. The latter had remained in office after the retirement of Mr. Pitt and Lord Temple, and was, in consequence, deprived of their friendship and intimacy. The cause of the rupture is easily traced in the correspondence printed in the first of the works named at

the head of this article. We do not wonder at the alienation which ensued. Under the circumstances of the case it could scarcely be otherwise. Lord Bute evidently made a point of retaining Mr. Grenville. His talents were considerable, yet not so first-rate as to permit his setting up on his own account. Separated from his brother and brother-in-law, he was probably expected to be at once useful and pliant, serviceable as the leader of the lower house, and grateful to the favorite who commended him to the king. The following letter discloses the terms of intimate friendship in which Grenville's aid was sought:—

'MY DEAR GEORGE,—I write to you in a very painful minute. Mr. P. has taken leave of us, and the king left in a most perilous situation to form a new ministry. I avoided the desiring you to stay in town, though I thought this event likely, and that out of real tenderness to you, judging it more eligible for my friend to go to the country and remain there 'till the king desired his presence, than by waiting here to seem in a state of expectancy. I hope you will think my opinion no unkind one. I own to you, so impossible have I found it for some time past to go on with any hopes of success, that I should have thought it necessary at this juncture for our sovereign to have taken new ministers, though untried, inexperienced men; but the high opinion I have of you, the warm friendship I feel for you, and the entire confidence I place in you, makes me see this dereliction with much more indifference than I otherwise should do. I know your love for the king; and I flatter myself, when his service demands your presence, you will not lose a minute in coming here. Jenkinson flatters me I may see you to-morrow at dinner. 'Till then, my dear George, adieu! Yours most entirely, BUTE.'

Grenville Papers, vol. ii., pp. 392, 393.

Lord Bute's ministerial efforts were unavailing. His influence with the king and the princess dowager was omnipotent; but throughout the nation he was regarded with disfavor, which neither his capacity nor his experience enabled him to surmount. The English people are specially hostile to court favorites; and in the present case national antipathies were employed to spread the discontent. The cabinet, moreover, was divided, and some of the Government measures were open to very severe and damaging reflections. Mr. Pitt, on first leaving office, was cautious and moderate; but his terrible oratory was ere long directed against the policy of the Crown. It was therefore felt necessary to enlarge what Lord Bute termed 'the too narrow bottom of the cabinet.' This was announced to Mr. Grenville October 10th, 1762, and negotiations were set on foot with a view to it. These, however, proved abortive, and the favorite was compelled to bow before the storm of popular disfavor. It would be difficult to exaggerate his un-



popularity. It was at once intense and universal. Wherever he appeared, the voice of the people was raised against him, and serious apprehensions were entertained for his personal safety. Writing to Lord Hardwicke, April 11th, Viscount Royston says:—

‘The alarms of Lord Bute’s family about his personal safety are reported here to be the immediate cause of this sudden and unexpected *abdication*. I shall make no *reflections* on this strange scene; your lordship has already reflected much better for *yourself*. The *nil admirari* of Horace seems in our days to be as applicable to politics as it is to ethics and philosophy.’—Memoirs, vol. i. p. 165.

Bute pleaded ill-health as the cause of his retirement; but no person was deceived. It was known on all hands, and by all parties, that he resigned office because he could no longer carry on the government. Had it been possible to do so with safety to himself and the king, he would have remained nominally, as he was still really, the adviser of his sovereign. His sole dependence had ever been on the royal favor. In the closet he was omnipotent, but *without* that charmed enclosure he was amongst the weakest and most detested of men. His powers of mischief indeed were still considerable. He could sow dissension, could whisper away reputation, could raise up amongst ‘the king’s friends’ opponents to the king’s ministers; and thus perplex councils, which he was not permitted to rule, and embarrass men on whom had been devolved the management of national affairs. As a minister, however, he was incompetent and powerless. The king would have retained him; but the necessity of affairs constrained his resignation. On the 25th of March, 1763, he wrote to Mr. Grenville, informing him of his purpose, and inviting him to take the premiership. It was imposed, however, as a condition, that he should ‘forget old grievances, and cordially take the assistance of all the *king’s friends* that are determined to give it.’ Bute, it is obvious, possessed full power to name his successors, and he probably expected to rule the royal councils, though nominally separated from them. How far he was disappointed is shown in the subsequent part of this history.

On the 8th of April, Mr. Grenville was declared First Lord of the Treasury, and a fortnight afterwards appeared the celebrated ‘Number forty-five of the North Briton,’ in which severe strictures were passed on Lord Bute and the king’s ministers.

‘After a week’s deliberation, Wilkes was seized on a *general warrant*, and brought before Lords Halifax and Egremont, by whom he was committed to the Tower. His demeanour on the occasion would have served as a warning to wiser men against meddling with such a firebrand. On arriving at the place of his imprisonment, he wounded the stately pride of

Lord Egremont, by desiring to be confined in the same apartment where his father, Sir William Windham, had been kept on a charge of Jacobitism; and the national vanity of Lord Bute, by hoping that, if possible, he might not be lodged where any Scotchman had been prisoner.

'On the very day of his commitment to prison, his friends procured a writ of habeas-corpus from the Court of Common Pleas; and on the 3rd of May he was brought before Lord Chief Justice Pratt. In a speech, which lasted an hour, Wilkes complained "that he had been worse treated than any rebel Scot," a remark that was hailed with loud acclamations by the crowd in Westminster Hall. Three days afterwards, Pratt delivered his judgment, in which he declared that Wilkes was "entitled to his privilege as a member of parliament, because, although that privilege does not hold against a breach of the peace, it does against what only *tends* to a breach of the peace." Wilkes was, in consequence, set at liberty.—*Ib.* p. 166.

We avoid entering on the disgraceful contest that ensued. The government most stupidly committed itself to a conflict with Wilkes on unconstitutional grounds, and in a spirit of bitter personal hostility. Unpopular itself, it converted an audacious and profligate demagogue into a martyr for liberty, thus enabling a reckless adventurer to trade on the patriotism and generosity of the people. But we need not enlarge. There is no difference of opinion as to the worthlessness of Wilkes, or the policy of that ministry which suffered itself to be embroiled in such a contest. 'The Grenville Correspondence' supplies ample proof of the close intimacy that existed between Lord Temple and Wilkes, and of the pecuniary aid which the former supplied to the latter. We are glad that the intimacy did not extend to Pitt. The coarse manners and profligacy of Wilkes might be tolerated by the master of Stowe, but would have been sadly out of place in the presence of the elder Pitt. We dismiss the subject with a brief extract from a letter of Wilkes to Lord Temple, July 9, 1763, in which his hatred to the king, and his servility to his noble correspondent, are sufficiently indicated:—

'I hear from all hands that the king is enraged at my insolence, as he terms it: I regard not his frowns nor his smiles. I will ever be his faithful subject, never his servant.

'Churchill has stolen some of my ideas:—

"I cannot truckle to a fool of state,  
Nor take a favour from the man I hate."

'Hypocrisy, meanness, ignorance, and insolence, characterize the king I obey. My independent spirit will never take a favour from such a man. I know that I have neither the lust of power nor of money; and if I leave my daughter less dirty coin, I will leave her more honest fame. I trust, next to her own virtue, her greatest honour will be derived from her father. I am every day more and more philosophic and retired. I live

to the world, not with the world. I am my own man and Lord Temple's. If I have any talents which can please, they shall ever be dedicated to his service. I know that next winter I shall be *wholly* the man of business, and indefatigable in it; yet all my pursuits shall be directed, all my studies drawn to the focus he prescribes.—Grenville Papers, vol. ii. p. 73.

Of the Grenville administration we say little. It was short-lived, and its record is inglorious. Mr. Macaulay is not far wrong in representing it as the worst 'which has governed England since the Revolution.' Destitute alike of royal favor and of popular support, it was the mere creature of the day, called into existence to serve the purpose of Lord Bute, when constrained to retire from the king's councils, and incapable, therefore, of maintaining itself when his support was withdrawn. So long as it was possible, Bute remained at the head of affairs; and when this could be continued no longer, he sought to perpetuate his policy and rule, through the medium of a nominee. This could not continue long. Grenville was too proud and ambitious to act the part assigned him by Bute; the king detested his ministers; the American colonists were driven into rebellion; and the prosecution of Wilkes, notwithstanding his utter worthlessness, turned against the government whatever patriotism existed at home. Negotiations, therefore, were speedily opened with Mr. Pitt, who was summoned to the royal presence in August, 1763. The meeting took place at Buckingham Palace on Saturday, the 27th, and was immediately reported by Grenville to the Earl of Halifax. 'My interview,' says the minister, 'was very short, and no notice was taken of the long audience that preceded mine. I have since heard from other hands that *carte blanche* is given, which account tallies with such observations as I could make.' Pitt himself considered the arrangement concluded, and immediately summoned his political friends together. He miscalculated, however, the state of the royal mind. Bute's influence was still omnipotent; and though in the early stage of the negotiation he had favored Pitt's views, he was subsequently induced to throw his weight into the scale of Grenville. When, therefore, according to appointment, Mr. Pitt attended the king on the 29th, he was astonished to find that his whole arrangements were objected to, and a resolution obviously formed to retain the existing ministry. It is usual with the advocates of George III. and his favorite, to attribute the failure of this negotiation to the hard terms imposed by Mr. Pitt. They are shut up to this course. No other is open to them consistently with the royal integrity; yet it is quite clear that this line of defence is the mere result of necessity, and has no foundation in the



facts of the case. No objection was taken on the 27th to the terms proposed. On the contrary, they were supposed to be ceded; and the marvellous change exhibited on the 29th we are compelled to attribute to the interviews which, in the meantime, had taken place between the king and Lord Bute, and subsequently between the former and Mr. Grenville. The irresolution and timidity of Lord Bute, rather than the extravagant demands of Mr. Pitt, were the cause of the decision announced by George III. on the 29th. 'The Grenville Correspondence' throws much light on this knotty point of Court intrigue, and does not certainly raise our estimate of the straightforwardness and integrity of the king. Other proofs of duplicity exist in abundance, and the admirers of George III. will do well not to insist largely on his personal honor. We are much of Lord Shelburne's opinion, who, writing to Mr. Pitt, 'felicitates him personally and very sincerely on a negotiation being at an end, which carried through the whole of it such shocking marks of insincerity, and if it had taken another turn, must have laid a weight on his shoulders of a most irksome nature, on account of the peculiar circumstances attending it.'

Grenville was retained, and aid was procured from the Bedford section of the whigs. The alienation, however, between the king and his favorite on the one hand, and his nominal advisers on the other, became daily more obvious. Application was again made to Pitt, and for a time he was expected to take the lead of affairs. The Duke of Cumberland, uncle to the king, was the negotiator, and has left a narrative of the transaction which possesses much historical value. Lord Temple, however, refused to join Mr. Pitt, who, in consequence, declined the proffered honor. Lord Albemarle, referring to the failure of this negotiation, remarks, that 'if Pitt had been guided by his political principles, he would at once have coalesced with Lord Rockingham and his friends. But, influenced by Temple (who wished the 'brothers,' as they were called, should form a government of themselves), he declined the overtures of the court.' We are not clear that his lordship is right on this point. His theory does not square with the facts of the case, while the issue is more satisfactorily accounted for on a different supposition. The object of the king, it must be remembered, was to rid himself of George Grenville, towards whom he entertained a stronger dislike—and that is saying much—than to Pitt and Temple. It seems, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that the notion assigned by Lord Albemarle should have been entertained. It would have been, in fact, to counter-vail the policy of the king by forcing on him three unwelcome

ministers in place of the one he shunned; and its adoption, therefore, must have been in the last degree chimerical. Further than this, Mr. Pitt had practical experience of the hollowness of the court, and the little reliance to be placed on the monarch; and might, therefore, well shrink from undertaking the task proposed without the associate on whose fidelity he firmly relied, and to whom, as we have seen, he was under deep obligation. As to Temple himself, we need not go far to discover his motives. He had been insulted by the king and 'the king's friends,' and placed no reliance on the professions now made. Let this suffice for our present purpose. The negotiation failed, and after an abortive effort to secure the services of Lord Lyttleton, the former ministers were recalled for a season. We could have wished that a cordial understanding had taken place on this occasion between Pitt and the Rockingham whigs. It ought to have been so. Each would have contributed what the other required, and together they might have set the favorite at defiance, and compelled the servile crowd which gathered round the throne to leave state affairs to those who were responsible for them. The warmest admirers of Mr. Pitt must acknowledge that personal ambition probably affected his decision in this matter. There was so much in common between the political principles of himself and the Rockinghamites, and the efforts of the latter to secure his co-operation were so marked, that we cannot but regard his policy in relation to them as amongst the most questionable points of his public life.

Failing with 'the great commoner,' and subsequently with Lord Lyttleton, the king turned to the Marquis of Rockingham. A meeting of whig leaders was held in June 1765, and a majority resolved that, certain conditions being agreed to, they would assist to form a new administration. The character of the Marquis has been variously drawn. Lord Mahon does it gross injustice, affirming that 'everything about him bore the stamp of the tamest mediocrity,' and attributing his leadership exclusively to the aristocratical policy of the whigs. We are not disposed to deny that his 'extremely large and fine' estate, with his hereditary honors, had much to do with his selection. It has ever been the policy of the whigs to take their leaders from the nobility. With rare exceptions they have done so, and their reputation and party interests have thereby been greatly damaged. Men of genius have been permitted to serve in their ranks; but the instances are few of such being permitted to occupy the higher and more influential posts. Burke and Sheridan in former days, and Sir James Mackintosh in our own are cases in point. We are willing, therefore, to cede to Lord

Mahon that the circumstance he names had much to do with the adoption of Lord Rockingham, as the leader of the whigs; but his personal qualifications were much higher than is alleged. Even Lord Mahon admits that he 'had clear good sense and judgment, improved by the transaction of business. His character,' he adds, 'was without a stain, marked by probity and honour, by fidelity to his engagements, and by attachment to his friends.' Through every variety of fortune, he retained the allegiance of his party for eighteen years, and was amongst the most patriotic, and—if judged of by his measures—the most liberal statesmen of his day. In forming his ministry, Lord Rockingham did everything in his power to conciliate Mr. Pitt. 'With this view he appointed his friends, the Duke of Grafton and General Conway, Secretaries of State; his brother-in-law, James Grenville, Vice-Treasurer of Ireland; and raised Chief-Justice Pratt to the Peerage, with the title of Baron Camden. But the advancement of friends, relations, or recent colleagues did not conciliate the impracticable minister. He not only would not assist the government, but by the disparaging tone that he adopted, he discouraged many of his followers from joining them.'

Lord Albemarle sketches the character of the new premier with much more accuracy than Lord Mahon. His party leaning is doubtless observable, and from some of his judgments we dissent; but making due allowance, we accept the following as a correct delineation of one of the most virtuous and constitutional politicians known to our history:—

'Eighteen years the leader of a party, and twice summoned to the councils of his reluctant sovereign, Lord Rockingham holds a prominent station in the reign of George III. Nor can it be objected to him that the fidelity of his adherence was secured by the ordinary ties of faction or interest. Faith to their leader was, to the whigs, a virtual renunciation of all those rewards which a chief magistrate has it in his power to bestow. Their adherence was the loyalty of respect and affection, not the casual allegiance of a cabal. It stood the test of long discouragement. It survived the severer trial of a brief official prosperity. The causes of the attachment of his followers must be sought in the character of the leader himself. Lord Rockingham possessed by nature a calm mind and a clear intellect, a warm benevolent heart, of which amiable and conciliatory manners were the index. He was imbued with sound views of the principles of the constitution, and with a firm resolution to make those principles the guide of his actions. If eloquence were the sole criterion of a great leader or a great minister, Rockingham would have but small claims to such a title. The malady which consigned him to the tomb, when he was little more than fifty years of age, had imparted to his frame a sensibility of nerve which only extraordinary occasions enabled him to overcome. He was a hesitating and an inelegant debater.



His speeches, like those of the late Lord Althorp, commanded attention, not from the enthusiasm aroused by the persuasive arguments of the orator, but from the confidence placed in the thorough integrity and practical good sense of the man. He stood in a similar relation to a great minister—to a Fox, a Grey, or a Russell—which an able chamber-counsel bears to an Erskine. He lacked the outward graces. He possessed the inward power. If success in public measures be a test of ability, Rockingham stood pre-eminent. In no one year between the Revolution and the Reform Bill were so many immunities gained for the people, or, more properly speaking, so many breaches in the constitution repaired, as in what was contemptuously called the "Latestring Administration;" and all too in the face of one of the ablest and most unscrupulous oppositions, of which the king himself was the head.

'In his relations to George III., Rockingham was "impar congressus Achilli." He was thoroughly in earnest, but his earnestness was for his country. The king was likewise in earnest, but his earnestness was for his prerogative. The one was all honesty, the other all insincerity. As the reader proceeds, he will find the royal letters most gracious, the royal conduct most disingenuous. He will perceive that the king authorized his ministers to contradict rumours which himself had circulated, and that the "King's friends" were busily employed in refuting the official statements of the cabinet. Had George III. possessed common sincerity, Lord Rockingham's efforts to preserve the American colonies would probably have been effectual. But between the minister, whose "virtues were his arts," and the monarch, who, like Lysander, pieced the lion's hide with the fox's skin, the struggle was unequal, and Rockingham was arrested in his career of usefulness, and added one more ministerial victim to royal duplicity.'—'Memoirs,' vol. i. pp. 140-142.

It was not to be expected that the king would regard his new ministers with much favor. It was from no partiality that he adopted them. Of all political sects, they belonged to the one most distasteful to him. Their wealth and party connexion rendered them more independent than suited the temper of the monarch, and his 'friends' consequently soon recorded their votes against them. One of the first measures of Lord Rockingham was the repeal of Mr. Grenville's Stamp Act, 'and from that hour,' we are told, 'the king determined to remove him.' Anything more false, more unworthy of a monarch, or more foreign from the spirit of the constitution, cannot well be imagined than the conduct of George III. at this crisis. The American colonies were in rebellion; his responsible advisers deemed the repeal of the Stamp Act essential to the restoration of tranquillity; but the personal adherents of the king, the men who were in his confidence, and made his will their rule, voted against the repeal. 'The second Lord Hardwicke, after assigning, in his own "Memorial," his reasons for assenting to the repeal, adds: "But, from a *personal inclination* of the king, and influenced by Lord Bute and the Princess Dowager, the

followers of Court favor went the other way, and half the Court at least voted in opposition to administration." To vindicate the honor of George III. in this matter is impossible. We would advise his advocates to say little respecting it. He may have been a faithful husband; his private morals may have been irreproachable; his observance of the externals of religion decent and devout. We are not disposed to question these things; but as a monarch, he knew little of the spirit of our constitution, and, had times permitted, would have stretched the prerogative as far as any of his predecessors. We say it with regret; but truth compels the assertion, that he was utterly unfitted to discharge the trust of a constitutional monarchy.

Negotiations with Mr. Pitt were speedily reopened, and were conducted with a secrecy which sought to elude the observation of ministers. At this very time the king avowed to his advisers—who were desirous of securing Mr. Pitt's co-operation—that it was not consistent with his dignity to open 'a fresh treaty with that gentleman.' 'The fact was,' as Horace Walpole states, 'the king, not desirous of the junction of Pitt and the actual ministers, and choosing that Pitt should solely to him owe his admission, pleaded that he had sent so often for Mr. Pitt in vain, that he would condescend no more, a resolution his Majesty was at that very time in the intention not to keep.' Walpole is not always a safe guide; but in this case his view is confirmed by other and more trustworthy authorities. 'Lord Rockingham himself told me,' says Nicholls, 'that the king never showed him such distinguished marks of kindness as after he had secretly determined to get rid of him.' The result of these intrigues was the dismissal of the Rockingham administration in the following July, and the appointment of William Pitt, under the title of Earl Chatham, to the premiership. Burke published a masterly summary of the conduct of the ministry during their brief tenure of office, in the course of which he truthfully asserts—

'With the Earl of Bute they had no personal connexion, no correspondence of councils. They neither courted him nor persecuted him. They practised no corruption, nor were they even suspected of it. They sold no offices. They obtained no reversions or pensions, either coming in or going out for themselves, their families, or their dependents.

'In the prosecution of their measures they were traversed by an opposition of a new and singular character; an opposition of placemen and pensioners. They were supported by the confidence of the nation. And having held their offices under many difficulties and discouragements, they left them at the express command, as they had accepted them at the earnest request, of their royal master.'—*Ib.* p. 370.

We shall not dilate on the events which followed, having recently noticed them in our review of Lord Mahon's 'History.' Our space too is exhausted, or we should give entire the letter of the Princess Charlotte, dated Jan. 12th, 1812, in which she dwells with so much complacency on the character of Charles James Fox. We must, however, content ourselves with pointing the reader's attention to it. It is one of the most remarkable documents we have read; and considering the period at which it was written, and the position of its author, is eminently deserving of attention. Lord Albemarle's sketch of Thurlow (vol. ii. pp. 447—451) is one of the most elaborate and finished portions of his work; but, for the reason already stated, we refrain from quoting it.

We have only space to record our high estimate of the value of both these works, and to commend them most cordially to the students of English history. Lord Albemarle's volumes are the most readable;—indeed their attraction is equal to their merit. He has displayed great judgment in the execution of his task, and has added largely to the accessible stores of our historical literature.

ART. VII.—*Tower-Church Sermons; Discourses preached in the Tower Church, Belvedere, Erith, Kent.* By the Rev. A. Monod, Paris; the Rev. Dr. Krummacher, Berlin; the Rev. T. Binney, London. Edited by T. Binney. London: Jackson and Walford. 1852.

For some years past, Mr. Binney has almost entirely abstained from controversy. For ourselves, we are inclined to regret this. His intellectual gifts fit him so well for exposing and refuting the absurdities of sacramental superstition that we are unwilling to see his offensive weapons rusting for want of use. But his pen has not been idle. Many readers will think that it has been much better employed even than in refuting high church pretensions and tractarian absurdities.

He is not the author of the whole of the volume to which we now invite the attention of those of our readers who have not yet studied it. The title is unfortunately chosen. It conveys no idea of the contents of the book, except to the persons who heard the sermons, or who know the church, on Sir C. E. Eardley's estate at Erith, in which they were delivered. It may be needful to explain that one of these sermons, 'The Law our



Schoolmaster,' was preached by Mr. Binney at the opening of the Tower Church, and that the three others were preached, in the same church, after the special meetings of the Evangelical Alliance had been held in London last year. Of these three, the first is by A. Monod, and was delivered in French; the second by Dr. Krummacher, and was delivered in German. These have been translated into English for the volume before us. The remaining discourse, 'Salvation by Fire, and Salvation in Fulness,' was preached by Mr. Binney on the same interesting occasion.

Both Mr. Binney's sermons have been written since they were preached, and have been also very much enlarged. They fill 200 out of the 275 pages which this volume contains.

We do not wish to disparage the sermons, by our foreign brethren, here presented to us in such goodly fellowship, but shall pass at once to Mr. Binney's discourses, which we are especially desirous of bringing before our readers. We do not know his own estimate of them; but they contain so many indications of having been written both carefully and with delight in themes felt to be congenial to his mind and heart, that we should not wonder to hear him say,—'If any one wishes to know me as a preacher, it is by these sermons I should prefer to be judged.' Originally they were spoken with the noble freedom which, as we think, becomes the Christian preacher incomparably better than the slavery to the manuscript to which we lament to see so many nonconformist ministers submitting themselves. When the preacher began to recall his trains of thought, and to give suitable written expression to them, his interest in them increased. He saw in them a special adaptation to the Christian young men of the present day. In the one, 'The Law our Schoolmaster,' he addresses almost exclusively the intellect, endeavouring to aid his youthful readers especially in their acquisition of Christian truth. In the other discourse he addresses the conscience and the heart, seeking to aid his readers in their efforts after practical excellence. The one is a specimen of the argumentative, the other of the hortative, sermon.

The text of the first sermon is Gal. iii. 24 and 25; its subject—'Judaism preparatory to Christianity, and spiritually developed in the Gospel.' This sermon is constructed on a plan which is applicable to almost every argumentative discourse; and it has not, therefore, the charm which is felt when everything in a discourse is seen to belong to its own text, and to no other. The preacher purposes to 'explain and illustrate the apostle's statement, and to add to the exposition such

general concluding remarks as the subject may seem appropriately to suggest.'

We shall not attempt an analysis of this discourse. It is characterised by exceedingly close thinking and concise expression, and cannot be abridged except by being mutilated. Many of its sentences might be expanded into volumes. They will be to many readers the seeds of thought.

Our purpose may, perhaps, be best accomplished by indicating very briefly the end which the preacher has in view,—the questions which he helps his readers 'to study,' that they may make progress towards the satisfactory solution of them. These questions relate to points of moral and religious truth, which thoughtful students of scripture have long felt to be of much difficulty, and yet of great importance. They arise as we compare with each other the Old Testament and the New, the ceremonies and emblems of Judaism and the facts and truths of Christianity. It is difficult to give definite explanations (except so far as the Epistle to the Hebrews guides us) of the relations between those ceremonies and these facts, those emblems and these truths. It is more difficult to throw ourselves back into the intellect and heart of 'the church in the wilderness,' and to show how far the devout Jew read Christian truths in Mosaic emblems, how far, even, these emblems were intended to be understood by him, and in what precise way these emblems are to instruct and benefit ourselves.

The preacher's answers to these questions are given with the caution of one who has felt their difficulty, but with the clearness of one who has distinguished accurately between those parts of his subject which must remain doubtful, and those parts of it in which certainty is the recompence of patient and devout inquiry. Light is poured upon the whole theme. We feel as if an accomplished and spiritually enlightened priest were our guide through the Jewish temple, and were disclosing to us the hopes and wishes, 'the throbbings and searchings of heart,' the 'passionate longings after a higher life and more spiritual conceptions,' which arose with him as, in favoured seasons, he ministered at the altar and 'inquired in the temple.' We are thus prepared to recognise in the gospel 'Judaism spiritually developed.'

'The tabernacle and temple seem to enlarge their proportions. The earth is the court in which death is inflicted; the overhanging sky is the mysterious veil; and high heaven, the dwelling-place of God, is the holy of holies. The one only sacrifice is understood to be that of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; the virtue of those sacrifices which sanctified only to the purifying of the flesh, or to the conferring of an external and ritual absolution, is seen to typify 'the blood that cleanseth from all

sin'—which purges the conscience, and literally reconciles man to God,—pp. 100, 101.

The first aim of this discourse is the explanation of Scripture to the believing and docile inquirer; the next is the refutation of superstitious corruptions of Christianity, and of sceptical objections against it.

The Scriptural principles which are established in the expository part of the sermon, are applied, directly or analogically, to the prominent questions and controversies of our own time. This is done with most fulness and strength with reference to prevailing errors regarding sin and forgiveness. Of this argument, Mr. Binney says in a note, that it is 'professedly a mere outline,' 'quite fragmental,' and that 'instead of being referred to in one division of a discourse, the subject requires a whole discourse to itself, and may, perhaps, some day have one.' Compared with a treatise on sin and pardon, such as, with health and leisure, Mr. Binney could produce were he to apply his highest energy, and bring all his resources to the noble task, this argument is, of course, truly 'a fragment;' yet, as an outline, it is singularly complete and satisfactory. The principle that 'future punishment is not an infliction, but a result; not a thing added to sin by external power, but flowing out of it, by inevitable necessity,' shows at once and decisively the folly of the sentimental notion that sin need not awaken any deep emotion, since forgiveness is easily obtained. The same principle, taken in connexion with the revealed fact of a supernatural redemption, affords a confutation of the conclusion which is drawn by certain more patient and logical thinkers, that '*there can be no forgiveness of sin at all.*' In this part of the sermon, evangelical truths are shown to be the explanations of sceptical difficulties,—the solutions of sceptical doubts,—in way that pours on our minds the self-evidencing light of Scripture, and will, we trust, lead many minds to the truth—and to peace in believing.

When the philosopher says, and says 'possibly with sadness and tears, tears wrung from him by the force of his relentless logic, I see no hope of the forgiveness of sin; properly understood it would involve a miracle—nothing less; a supernatural interference with established law. I can see no ground for expecting *that*. Christianity replies, 'but I can and I do; I come to announce exactly that thing which you feel to be necessary . . . It is, then, my office to make known the divine fact, the miraculous interposition, which your philosophy tells you is required, but of which, instead of showing the possibility, it can only teach you to despair.'—pp. 144, 146.

The sermon on 'Salvation by fire and salvation in fulness—the



Christian doctrine of warning and reward,' will probably be preferred by very many readers to the preceding discourse. It taxes the attention much less, and interests more the imagination and the feelings. Two texts are taken (1 Corinthians, iii. 13, and 2 Peter, i. 10, 11.) In a very few introductory sentences the pith of these texts is placed before us. The central subject is Salvation. Two sides of it are exhibited,—in the allegory addressed to the Church at Corinth, salvation with difficulty, '*so as by fire*';—in the beautiful exhortation of St. Peter, salvation in fulness, '*an abundant entrance*' into Christ's everlasting kingdom. The whole subject is illustrated and enforced by 'going over the previous trains of thought with which each text is connected,' rather than by preaching from the two texts themselves. Hence we have full expositions of two of the most important passages in the New Testament, expositions which deserve the careful and repeated study of all who wish to understand the Scriptures, and especially of those who wish to acquire or to cultivate the invaluable talent of pulpit exposition. The meaning is brought out vividly and forcibly. Conviction is produced, not so much by *proving* the interpretation to be correct, as by the clear statement, to which the mind responds as the statement of that which *must* be true. In the first exposition we seem to see—the builders engaged in their work—to witness the trial and its issues. We triumph with the builder whose work abides, who 'receives a reward,' and then shudder, as if we were ourselves almost consumed with the builder whose work is burned, and who himself is 'scarcely saved.' The other exposition is of a very different character; it is less impressive, but much more beautiful. The principle of the metaphor, employed in the first passage, affords a key to the interpretation of the second. Each Christian is a temple. The virtues which the apostle commends are the 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' which are to be built upon faith, the foundation grace. Each of these virtues is clearly described, and accurately distinguished from the rest; and the fair proportion and harmony of the whole of these graces, in the character of the mature Christian, are portrayed before us. And then comes a description of the 'abundant entrance' of such a saint into his Saviour's kingdom, to *hear* which must have been like standing with Bunyan's pilgrim in sight of the gates of Paradise. The imagery employed is almost hackneyed. It the more required genius to give to it freshness and force.

'You may take another illustration from a vessel returning after a long voyage, and being received and welcomed by expectant friends. She has been, let us suppose, absent for years; has been toiling and trafficking in every sea, touching in the ports and trading in the markets of many lands; she is approaching at last her "desired haven," the harbour from which

she set out, whence loving thoughts went with her as she started on her perilous way, and where anxious hearts are now wishing and waiting for her return. She is descried in the distance; the news spreads; all is excitement; multitudes assemble; pier and quay, beach and bank, are crowded with spectators, as the little craft pushes on, and every moment nears her destination. There she is! wind and weather-beaten it is true, covered with the indications of sore travail and long service, and with many signs of her having encountered both battle and breeze. But all is safe. Her goodly freight is secure and uninjured; her profits have been large; the merchandize she brings is both rich and rare; she is coming along over a sunny sea, leaping and dancing as if she were alive; her crew are on the deck, and, with straining eyes and palpitating hearts, are looking towards the shore. A soft wind swells the sails; the blue heavens are bending over the bark as if smiling on her course, while the very waves seem to run before her, turning themselves about as with conscious joy, clapping their hands, and murmuring welcome! How she bounds forward! she is over the bar! she is gliding now in smooth water; is passing into port; and is preparing to moor and to drop her anchor for the last time! While she does so, there comes a shout from the assembled spectators—the crowds that witness and welcome her approach—*loud as thunder, musical as the sea.*—pp. 224—226.

This is the preacher's illustration of 'salvation in fulness.' For beauty and nobleness it is a passage rarely equalled, and scarcely ever surpassed.

The practical inferences and appeals which conclude this discourse, invite quotation and remark, but our space will permit only one observation. In a way that must have been startling to hearers accustomed only to the technicalities of systematic theology, Mr. Binney insists upon excellence of character as indispensable, not, indeed, to salvation itself, but to 'salvation in fulness.' There is a *prize* of our high calling as well as a *gift* of eternal life. Only by eminent personal virtue can that prize be won. The statements and appeals to which we now refer deserve to be deeply pondered, especially by all who are engaged in Christian teaching. One objector might allege that the preacher is *legal*, and complain that he demands good works with an urgency inconsistent with 'the doctrines of grace.' Another objector might take advantage of the strong requirement of purity as the meetness for heaven, to infer that there must be a purgatory in which this indispensable purity may be acquired. The preacher is not careful to answer either class of objectors, except by falling back on obvious scripture declarations, the truths which are taught by inspired men, and which, because so taught, must be in harmony with each other and with all truth, whether we can perceive the harmony or not.

We must refrain from specifying various characteristics of Mr. Binney's preaching, which are prominent in these dis-

courses. One feature we are pleased to notice as more obvious than in his preceding publications—the copious and skilful quotation of scripture. The texts quoted are such as precisely to meet and supply the defects that are felt in the teachings of merely natural religion. They are recognised as the voice of God answering the questionings of man. They are necessary to the argument. They resemble not so much the ornaments of a column as the key-stone of an arch.

We covet a diction more purely Saxon than that employed in some portions of these sermons; for we should, indeed, be sorry if modern innovators, upon the purity, sweetness, and strength of our noble English language should be able to quote, even a single sentence or word of Mr. Binney's, in palliation of their affectation and pedantry. The specimens we have given will show that there is much to be admired in the style of these sermons, as well as in their thoughts; and we freely commend them to all who welcome the bold, yet reverent, investigation of moral and religious truth.

---

ART. VIII.—*Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford: together with the Evidence, and an Appendix.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of her Majesty. London: 1852.

THE inability of corporations for self-reform is a familiar axiom of political thought; and of all corporations, none are so incapable of it as the ecclesiastical. If indeed they are subjected to a quasi-monarchical sway, beneath some pope or general of the order, there is just a possibility that a man of genius and resolution may be found sooner or later in that position, and may resolutely commence a career of reform. History indeed gives little confirmation even of this faint hope; but in the corporations which are internally oligarchical or democratic, the case seems to be quite desperate.

Perceiving the enormous power to resist change possessed by our old universities, political reformers have long looked to parliament as the sole force capable of serviceably remodelling them. Supported by the interests of the church, they are far more occult than the church in their doctrines and system. At least in a Protestant country it is impossible to hinder laymen from sitting in judgment on church doctrines; but as to those



of the university, our abler public men show astonishing and unaffected diffidence even in their private conversation.

It is scarcely possible to move public enthusiasm in favour of a university reform, from the profound ignorance of the great mass of the people as to the nature of the existing evils or the suitable remedy. Hence many have felt great despondency as to the power of any statesmen to carry effective measures, except in the direction and for the victory of some newly-ascendant party.

But the English universities are institutions too peculiar to be judged of by any abstractions of politics, or any experience of history. Scarcely is their own history an adequate guide to our prognosis: yet, looking to it, we do find the remarkable fact, that, first, Cambridge, towards the close of the last century, and soon after Oxford, uncompelled by any political stir, introduced a great internal reform of the studies—a reform most necessary indeed, and in many respects far short of what was desirable, yet one which has made these institutions to be, instead of despicable, highly respectable, and, in certain directions, very efficient. As the church of Rome felt it necessary to improve her discipline and decorum, in order to oppose the Reformers, so do the most bigoted of our academics feel that a certain literary reputation is essential to their rank, and honour, and safety: and though they may lag behind the public awakening, they will try to anticipate the public action.

This is evidently the side (internal reform of the studies) on which the obstacles to change are weakest, and the inward impulse to movement strongest: and if this be once carried out effectively, other reforms will not be long delayed. It is at least our creed, that whenever the ablest men in Oxford and Cambridge have their due weight, a constant effort for improvement of every kind will certainly be at work, and will very soon discover the unreasonableness and the mischief of those inflictions and disabilities of which Dissenters complain. In a papal and Jesuitical *regime*, a 'reform' is never anything but the white-washing of a sepulchre: knowledge is not free, nor vigour imparted to the mind. But when our universities become ambitious to attract professors eminent in every branch, and to become celebrated schools of all high science, they must necessarily leave and make the mind free, and ecclesiastical domination will become impossible. In fact, it is already felt impossible to exact subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles from professors of modern languages. It will soon appear, when a Faraday or a Liebig, or, it may be, an Ewald, is to be attracted to the university, whether this barrier will not be forced to give way. Subscription seems, perhaps, a light thing to residents who

have been accustomed to it from boyhood; but when proposed suddenly to men of mature age, its solemnity will assuredly make it an unendurable yoke, and the university will be called on either to throw it off or visibly to lose men of pre-eminence. In such circumstances we expect the effort for removing the subscription to come from within.

Undoubtedly there are changes most necessary to the improvement of the universities which cannot be effected by university power, were it unanimous. But this very circumstance is a moral justification to the reforming minority for appealing to parliament, and lessens their disinclination to such a step. The real question then is, What is the strength and respectability of this reforming minority? Does it, in a numerical or moral sense, grow stronger or weaker? Is it likely to give to statesmen and to parliament that moral courage in which they are proverbially so deficient, when called to interfere with even the shadow of the church?

Here we are happy to be able to give a reply favourable to the interests of freedom and the hopes of rightful progress. Confining ourselves to that university which is treated of in the very ample report before us, we see everything to denote that the better elements in Oxford must prevail over the worse. The ambition of the place will be too much for its bigotry. There are, in fact, numerous causes which assure us of deep inward discontent, likely to increase and to give a greater and greater impetus to the reforming party. It was not the object of the Commission to state and explain these, yet they appear distinctly enough in the report, and need to be well meditated on and digested by those who desire university reform.

In the last two centuries, physical science has arisen from its infantine state of hypothesis and conjecture, and has assumed the adult form of demonstration or cogent proof. In the same period, a vast growth of German, French, and English literature has taken place, and the extension of the British power has put us in close relation to the languages of the East and West. The vast new accumulations of knowledge, both in science and literature, dwarf the old classics, and make the Oxonians uncomfortably sensible that their institutions are old-fashioned. Zealous friends of Oxford have founded a large number of professorships for new studies, which the university has uniformly accepted—ambition prevailing over caution—and has thus nurtured in her bosom an important element of disaffection. The professors are, or ought to be, by station, and age, and scientific culture, the ablest men in the university; their name and authority must necessarily carry weight with it, and by the peculiar development of affairs they are made pre-

cisely the permanent nucleus of reforming efforts. Even the old theological professors are discontented, however little disposed to the reforms which we might desire. More than twenty years ago, Dr. Pusey, on becoming professor of Hebrew, dissatisfied at the total neglect of his branch of study, endeavoured to encourage it by liberally founding\* new scholarships, with the aid of his brother, Mr. Philip Pusey, the agriculturist, and a certain Dr. Ellerton. The desire and the effort were noble, but the result has been almost nothing. After this, Dr. Burton, the regius professor of divinity, was scandalized that degrees in divinity are taken without any examination, and with a notorious absence of superior acquirements or ability. The knowledge of theology which suffices to scrape through the examination for holy orders must be kept down to the minimum, which will not damage the property of titled patrons; yet this small minimum suffices afterwards to obtain also the degrees of *bachelor* and *doctor* of divinity. But the attempts of Dr. Burton were all in vain, and it is clearer than ever that neither Hebrew nor Theology can be cultivated at Oxford without some great reform. This conviction cannot be very pleasant to theological professors of the present day, however conservative in other respects.

The professors of law and of medicine (who in the old system were next in importance) are in a still more hopeless case. They are called to haunt desolated halls, and to listen to the quiet declaration that 'it is neither possible nor desirable for Oxford to be a great school of law or of medicine.' The mathematical professors are by no means so ill-treated, at least in the theory of the university studies; nevertheless they find that in practice their subjects cannot receive the attention which they claim; and, we believe, these professors have for the last twenty-five years been regarded with suspicion or displeasure by the conservatives, as peculiar stimulators of reforming efforts.

But if the *old* professors are neglected in the university system, what shall be said of the *newer*? Men who have any love or taste for their own branch of knowledge are discontented to find themselves turned into mere show-lecturers, and that energetic pupils are never to be hoped for. The university likes the credit of well-sounding names, and succeeds in getting a respectable quota of men eminent, though not pre-eminent, each in his own science; and the number is formidable.

\* At this very time, Mrs. Kennicott, widow of the Hebrew scholar, Dr. Kennicott, had bequeathed certain monies for founding two Hebrew scholarships at Oxford, £70 a year each. There are *three* Pusey and Ellerton scholarships, of £30 a year.



Botany, chemistry, geology, mineralogy, medicine, anatomy, jurisprudence, law, morals, poetry, political economy, Anglo-Saxon, Italian, Arabic, Sanskrit, Hebrew, modern history, do not exhaust the list of professorships. The holders of these find too little sympathy, and no aid, in their studies within the academic precincts; and whether their clinging be weaker or stronger to Toryism or to Puseyism, they have an inward sense that things are not as they ought to be,—that, however undesirable the process of a parliamentary reform, the end aimed at must give moral weight to it. No resident professor will struggle hard against a reform which re-distributes revenue and power in order to improve the university without touching the interests of the church; most of them will wish well to it, many will give it their avowed and eager support, and those who oppose are not likely to put forth fanatical energy.

At the same time, among the tutors of colleges, new and unexpected advocates for reform have arisen. The impetus given to the public schools, which may be dated, perhaps, from 1828, when Dr. Arnold became head master of Rugby—the year in which also University College in London was founded—has introduced into them many of the best scholars of the universities; and as they do not vacate their places by marriage, the pupil who passes from school to college frequently finds that he goes to a less able, because a younger, tutor. We know that many Oxford tutors are secretly humbled, by feeling that they are inferior to the masters at the public schools; and they are painfully aware that their classes are beneath the requirements of their abler students. Nor is this all. The tutor dares not to give the class his own best knowledge, but must accommodate himself to the average, and must work towards the ‘schools’ (or public examination) as his goal. He is depressed into a teacher of grammar, when he desires to rise into higher questions; and the greater his activity of mind and his powers, the greater his desire of certain reforms.

Such are in fact the influences which, two or three years ago, carried through, first at Cambridge, and next at Oxford, very significant statutes of reform. The great object aimed at in these was, to enlarge the circle of possible study to the undergraduates. It was distinctly perceived that the large fraction of wholly or partially idle men, who, to their own loss and to the discredit of the university, passed three years within its precincts, were idle, chiefly because they could not be made to sympathize with those particular studies which alone were patronized in the schools. Many clever young men come to Oxford knowing twice as much Latin and Greek as is requisite for a degree. They instantly feel themselves superior to the

college lectures, and thus are tempted to waste a year in idleness. Afterwards, some make double efforts at study, others have lost both the taste and habit, and become confirmed dawdlers. Others have no taste at all for ancient languages, but might, perhaps, pursue studies in which hitherto the university has provided no public examinations. The desire to turn these energies into a wholesome and recognised channel, and at the same time, to obtain classes of diligent pupils for the many neglected professors, animated the movement in both universities. It was probably aided also by a reaction against Puseyism. We do not mean to deny that this principle is decidedly in the ascendant at Oxford at present among the resident masters; we believe it is. But one effect of this remarkable mania was to turn the energies of young men into the reading of ecclesiastical fathers, and especially to produce distaste for all accurate science; so that the public professors were neglected far worse from 1835 to 1845 than they had previously been, at least in Oxford. After the tendency of these influences to Romanism had been so undeniably manifested, it is probable that the heads of houses (of whom a great majority have been *anti-puseyitical*) looked with less displeasure on the proposed change, from the vague hope that an increased prominence to a stable body of professors might usefully prevent in future so great a disturbance to university affairs as had recently been produced by the singular influence of one man without official position: of course we allude to Dr. Newman.

But one half of the statute of reform was rejected by the Oxford convocation; and the reforming party distinctly saw that, had it even passed entire, their objects would by no means have been achieved. Suppose examinations held, and honours awarded in the public schools, for jurisprudence, or for modern history, or for chemistry; was it to be hoped that the professors of these branches would have vigorous classes of pupils? Nay, but the experience even of the mathematical studies showed the vanity of this hope. Mathematical first classes are bestowed in Oxford; very capable instructors are not wanting; yet very few pupils of highest talent will give their energies to the study. Why? The reason is notorious. Because the fellowships are always attainable by mere knowledge of classics, but seldom or never by mathematical knowledge. The fellowships are not merely a pecuniary premium, they are also the only ordinary door of admission to permanent residence and power in the university. Such endowments are not only a bonus to the sciences which they profess to foster, but they act as a *discouragement* to all the others. The study of mathematics, or of law, or of chemistry, would have a far better chance

in Oxford, if the fellowships were swept away by confiscation. We do not know that such ill-omened words have ever been uttered in an Oxford common room; but we believe them to express the convictions of many a professor: and since such a change in the destination of the fellowships, as would be equitable to the sciences in general, is not within the power of the university or the colleges to effect, the recent reform is so far from superseding parliamentary interference, that such interference is even needed to hinder it from becoming a dead letter. We have named the *Hebrew* scholarships. Neither these nor the still more valuable *Sanskrit* scholarships produce any perceptible effect in giving energy to study. In some years, we are informed, just so many young men appear as candidates as there are scholarships to be received: and a very miserable modicum of knowledge is necessarily accepted as adequate.

Beside this, there is another class of reformers among the conservatives—evangelical or puseyite—who desire to lessen the expense of a university education, and see how little has hitherto been done by any of the enactments. One part is scandalized at the enormous debts which young men of middle rank are tempted and enabled to heap on themselves or their afflicted relatives: another is persuaded that great numbers of the middle and lower classes are kept away from the university solely by its large necessary expense; and that if this were reduced, its influence on the nation might be immensely increased. Whereas, at present, they see that while population multiplies, no commensurate increase of numbers is found at Oxford, but new institutions are formed, more or less independent of it; which implies that the university is falling in national importance. This state of feeling makes many persons not unwilling to see a moderate interference of parliament.

At the same time, the ablest college tutors probably would be glad to rise into the position of professors, in order to get rid of the enforced celibacy and of the mere grammatical tuition imposed on them; but of this they see no chance at present. To give up their fellowships is generally to give up their occupation for another, different in kind perhaps, as parish priests or as lawyers; and that this should be the normal state of a university is felt by them as quite indefensible. Nor do they see that it is possible to raise the quality of the college lectures generally without a public *entrance examination*, from which the university continues to shrink, through the fear of excluding the scions of noble families. This measure might, indeed, constitutionally be passed by the university itself; but probably will not, except by strong influences from without.

We have stated what causes have actuated the reforming



minority of Oxford to feel that the statute of 1850 by no means superseded, but rather required the aid of parliamentary enactments. But what induced Lord John Russell, at that very crisis, to issue a royal commission of inquiry, we are not able positively to ascertain. It certainly caused great surprise, and had not been at all expected. We incline to believe that the explanation is to be found in the slow and cautiously advancing character of Lord John's mind. Possibly, from the time that puseyism undeniably manifested itself as Romanism, he saw that the universities were exposed to serious danger from the antiquated nature of their institutions. He was then out of office; and upon this came the Irish famine, and the railway crash, and the continental revolutions; and Lord John may have put off his intended move until he found the moment at which he least feared embarrassment to his other plans, in case of its producing an explosion of hostility. But about this we can only conjecture.

It is amusing to see the tactics of the academic conservatives. In the reigns of our early kings, there are well-known visitations of the universities by *royal* commissioners. Under Charles I., the University of Oxford had no objection at all to such visitation, but vehemently protested against *parliamentary* visitation as democratic. Lord John Russell, desiring to avoid any outburst of that old controversy, appointed a royal commission; but the commissioners are now met with pretences of constitutionalism. Forsooth, if they have their powers only from the crown, and not from parliament also, they have no right to interfere! The secret doctrine of these academicians, of course, is, that the university is their private property, which they are to defend by whatever arguments a mere lawyer may suggest. If parliamentary commissioners come, they will call that a usurpation of a strictly royal right; but when the royal commissioners come, it is an unconstitutional straining of the prerogative. However, the commissioners wisely made short work with the legal question, by disavowing the desire to *compel* any one to give evidence. They *asked* evidence, and invited communications from all persons in dignity or in office, and accepted all the information and opinions tendered to them. In this way, they failed often of obtaining information in detail on many subjects (especially as to the *revenue* of the university and some of the colleges), but this has in no way affected their ability to draw up a valuable report, and support their conclusions by able reasoning and evidence. Perhaps we ought to be grateful to the reluctant academicians that they did not *all* communicate amply with the commission; else the 456 closely-printed folio pages of evidence might have swelled into 1600.

The commissioners selected by the crown were *seven* in number:—one bishop (Dr. Hinds, of Norwich); one head of a house (Dr. Jeune, of Pembroke College); one professor (Rev. Baden Powell); one head of a public school (Mr. Liddell, of Westminster School, known as a Greek lexicographer); one dean (Dr. Tait, of Carlisle, late head of Rugby); one lawyer (Mr. Dampier); and a Mr. Johnson, of Queen's College, known at Oxford as an able mathematician. Besides these, Mr. Stanley, the biographer of Dr. Arnold, and now canon of Canterbury, was secretary to the commission. From his pen, it is rumoured, that the actual drawing up of the very able report has proceeded. In its conclusion, a summary is given of *forty-seven* proposals of reform, which have been made in the course of its pages; and from this summary much additional facility of understanding is given to those who can but cursorily dip into so lengthy a report. To go through and explain each of these forty-seven points ever so concisely, would be beyond our limits, and would be almost like a reproducing of the report itself. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to noticing the points which are of chief importance, or of most interest to our readers.

The commissioners believe that the vast facilities derived by the university and colleges from their wealth, antiquity, public interest and confidence, adapt them for far greater services than those which they actually render to the country. Accordingly, the report advocates university *extension* in many senses. It desires more pupils and more teachers; more efficient teachers and more diligent pupils; more, and more certain, rewards to proficiency in every branch of study which the university professes; more, and more speedy, control over the studies by the public professors.

In order to increase largely the number of students, the first question is, how to find room; and here, without definitely urging any one method, the report recommends a free trial of all of four methods which have been more or less confidently recommended in the evidence—viz., to found new colleges, or new halls in connexion with some colleges, or to allow members of colleges to reside in private chambers, or to allow members of the university to reside independently in private chambers free from connexion with the colleges. The last form of admission is that which would chiefly, or perhaps alone, effect the object of greatly lessening the expenses of an academical degree; but it is for many reasons the proposal which of all in this report encounters the strongest opposition at Oxford. As it stands quite by itself, and may be dropt without affecting any other of the recommendations, there is no propriety in endeavouring,

as some have done, to damage the report by attacking this one point. But it seems to deserve from us here a special notice.

For students *beyond a certain age* (in the case of whom alone the report distinctly advises the change), there is no reasonableness in pressing the necessity of that transitional system which the walls of a college give, from a purely domestic to a wholly free life; and it is peculiarly to students of this maturer age (probably of the age of twenty-one) that many of the professors must look to their classes. If law, and jurisprudence, and medicine, and theology, and modern history, and Eastern languages, are to be efficiently pursued, a large number of the students must be past the age of domestic discipline. If there are public professors anxious for classes, it seems unfair, without some great necessity, to limit them to pupils who are to be afforded from the colleges, when such pupils may be disabled from attendance by the college regulations, over which neither the professor nor the university has any control. Supposing a minimum of age (say that of legal minority) to free a student from the necessity of being a member of a college, this would interfere very little indeed with the existing supply of pupils to the colleges, and might be of much importance to some of the professors.

- To build new colleges and halls is too expensive a process to be counted on, and implies growth by patronage more than by inward development. The commissioners, without expecting much from this, would permit it, under the condition that the *principal* of the hall should be appointed by the chancellor of the university. Concerning the *statutes* of new Houses they say nothing. We confess that we should look with much aversion on one possible result of too great freedom in this direction—viz., if this were exercised with the express object of upholding special religious opinions. In a national university, according to our ideal, all individuals of the nation should freely meet, without reference to their special religious opinions; and an aggressive and proselytising organised body, in the midst of a literary institution, is exceedingly to be deprecated. A few years back, it is certain that the friends of Mr. Sewell, or of Mr. (now Dr.) Newman, had the law allowed them, would have founded a college in Oxford for the express purpose of rooting and propagating puseyism: and a few years hence, it is within possibility that Drs. Wiseman and Newman, if then the law shall have put it within their power, may establish a Romish college there. The evil of this would be very slightly restrained by vesting the choice of principal in the chancellor, for he *must* be a Puseyite or a Romanist if the statutes were allowed to exact it. If parents found reason to imagine that in sending



their sons to Oriel or Christchurch they were exposing them to be decoyed into secret conferences with an unscrupulous combination organized to entrap young men into popery, the mere dread of this might inflict severe mischief on the university. To proselytism we have no objection, so that it be an open and honourable war of opinion, where no unfair advantage is taken of youth and inexperience: but even if we did not know of the sinister efforts in the last ten years made by Romish officials to proselyte the Rugby boys, the general history of Romanism would warn us as to what must be counted on from this quarter. If in the present stage it be allowed to the bishop of Exeter and Miss Sellon to establish a college at Oxford, *with their own internal regulations*, it will not be possible to admit Dissenters at any future time into the university without conceding to Rome the right of instituting colleges in Oxford devoted to her service. On these grounds, we are disposed to say that no absolute right to found new colleges (with fixed internal statutes) should be conceded to private persons; but that the university should have a veto on every new institution proposed in connexion with it, and a right to overrule its statutes at whatever time they should be found hurtful to the welfare of the university. A high power of this kind would never be used without strong necessity, and its very existence would aid to enforce good conduct.

Whatever be thought of either of these methods, that of *allowing* colleges to have students who reside outside the walls, seems beyond all reasonable objection. If moral evil should arise from it, the college itself will limit the permission more strictly, or decline to exercise the right. At Cambridge this has long been done, and without appreciable evil. To put power into the hands of the collegiate authorities in such a matter seems to be a most harmless kind of reform; and the effect would be great and immediate in enabling all the *best* colleges to increase by one-fourth, or by one-third, the number of their pupils. No college after this would be able to afford to have inferior tutors, and the backward societies would be rapidly brought up towards the level of the best. We must except those which have no free undergraduates—New College, Magdalen, All Souls—for which special enactments are on many grounds essential.

In order to lessen an evil which cannot be wholly extirpated, the inconsiderate contracting of debts, the commissioners advise that no debt whatever should be recoverable by law from a minor and undergraduate, unless the bill shall have been sent in to him within three months after the date of the earliest item; and in case of non-payment, a copy of the bill have been delivered within six months from the same date to the parent,

guardian, or college tutor. Moreover, for the recovery of debts, they advise that the vice-chancellor's court should proceed according to the forms of the county courts, and that the practice of the court should be thrown open.

In regard to university *legislation*, the report desires to destroy the too complete appropriation of the initiative by the board of the Heads of Houses. At present this board alone can introduce any measure, and convocation (or the assembly of masters and doctors) can merely say yes or no. The commissioners would reanimate the ancient body called the Congregation, which once consisted of the *bona fide* teachers of the university. If it were now to consist of professors and college tutors, it might beneficially have the right of deliberating in English, and originating measures to be approved or rejected by convocation. To prevent organized parties, or indefinite debate, the report advises that the congregation should not meet of necessity, but only when a certain fraction of its members require the vice-chancellor to summon it. Under such a constitution, it is probable that the Heads would desire to earn the credit of doing all the good work themselves, and so to supersede the summoning of the congregation.

The university professors at present are not a corporation, and can perform no university act *as* professors. They vote as graduates only. The report advises that they should be made a permanent *delegacy* (so they call a committee in Oxford), for superintending the public examinations, which would give to the professors a practical control over the studies, if the disturbing influence exercised now by the fellowships were removed. The Bodleian library also should be put under the management of this new committee.

In order to remunerate the professors more satisfactorily (for very few indeed are adequately endowed), the commissioners strongly urge to appropriate a certain number of the fellowships to this object. Magdalen College, for example, has forty fellows, of whom it is stated that the juniors receive about £250 a-year, while rumour assigns to the seniors near £500. The commissioners desire *twelve* of these fellowships to be appropriated to the endowment of *six* professors, who would be members and fellows of the college, like the rest, but be university officers, elected not by the college, but by the rightful authority without. Twenty-eight fellows would still remain for the direct service of the college, and this is more than could be needed for that object. Similarly, from other over-rich foundations, professors to the university might be supported.

But besides the professors and college tutors, the commis-

sioners desire the creation of university lecturers, and believe that the fungus-growth of private tuition (which is expensive to pupils, and unsatisfactory to the progress of teachers) would then be effectually stopped. Fees should be paid both to professors and lecturers, in increase of endowments; and in case no endowments can be had for the lectureships, the Report advises that a limited number of fellows of colleges, if appointed to lectureships, should be able to hold their fellowships even when married. The lecturers would be assistants to the professors, who would generally be elected either from the lecturers or from the college tutors. In this way the university would no longer lose its best men by marriage, and a continuous career would be opened, by which each branch of science might be selected as a lifework. Totally to rescind the law of celibacy, would too much break up the existing college relations, it is urged; but what we have stated shows that the commissioners desire to soften its present harshness.

They would also distribute the professors into four boards (or faculties?)—viz., I. Theology; II. Mental Philosophy and Philology; III. Jurisprudence and History; IV. Mathematical and Physical Science: and they regard the establishment of an efficient entrance-examination under university examiners as most essential to a real improvement. They propose to strip convocation, the Heads of Houses, and the graduates of divinity, of their present right of electing a few professors—(this is noticeable, not for the magnitude of the change, but for the principle,)—to leave the election of other existing professorships in their present hands, but to assign to the prime minister of the crown the patronage of all *new* professorships. This proposal is open to much discussion, as the commissioners are aware. On every side it is difficult to protect the exercise of patronage from sinister influences. We confess we fear that the best intentioned premiers will find no better course than to consult some particular friend among the heads of colleges on each occasion as to the right person to appoint. So it has been in the past; and we would rather that the crown, when each vacancy occurred, should nominate not fewer than five persons as a board to *report publicly* whom they *advise* to elect, and on what grounds. If responsible persons in the university were thus called to give public reasons, and the minister of the crown, after hearing their report, were free to take their advice or deviate from it, we believe that the advisers would exert their best powers to come to a right conclusion. Whether *candidature* to any of the offices should be invited or allowed, is also a secondary question of some importance, not dealt with in the Report.



It is, however, in regard to the colleges that the proposals of the commissioners are most stringent, and (in the existing prejudices of England) we are disposed to add, most meritorious. They broadly announce the fact that the statutes are not observed, cannot be observed, and, for the sake alike of morality and of high service, ought to be legally set aside. No more complete contrast is possible than that between the fellows of colleges as theoretically imagined by the founders, and the fellows as they actually exist. The fellows ought to be poor men, resident, and devoted to study and religious exercises. In Jesus' College, for instance, during dinner, the Bible should be read in hall; no one is to loiter or walk about under pain of fine or whipping; and all bachelors of arts, while within the college precincts, are to talk Latin, Greek, or *Hebrew*! The principal of this college, as of Wadham, was to be unmarried. At Queen's College, the fellows are to receive *ten marks yearly*, and £40 a-year is the maximum allowed in any case to the provost or Head. The fellows are never to sleep out of college except for a grave cause, and *two fellows at least* are to sleep in the same room. It is strictly commanded to increase the number of fellows in proportion to the increase of value in the estates, so as always to keep the fellows poor. These statutes the provost and fellows all swear to observe; but here, as nearly in all the colleges, those points which offend individual self-interest have been violated for centuries. In Magdalen College the founder utters imprecations on his society if the fellows do not abide by his statutes 'in their grammatical and literal meaning;' yet, against his command, they divide surplus revenues among them, and are the richest body in Oxford. He intended the head never to receive more than £40 a-year, and the fellows from twelve to sixteen pence a week; and he declares that any surplus shall be applied to the general good of the college, and '*strictly forbids, under pain of perjury*' any ampler allowances to the fellows '*in any way, or under any colour whatever.*' The president and fellows are bound to the observance of these statutes in oaths of elaborate length, and awful solemnity. Much the same may be said of New College. The warden is allowed £40 a-year by the founder; in fact, he receives £1400. The seventy fellows are to receive from twelve pence to eighteen pence a-week, according to the price of wheat; and 'that they may not blush for want of clothes,' each of them is to have every year cloth enough for a uniform livery, with six-and-eightpence for making and trimming! Not until a dress is five years old may they give it in charity to a poor freshman, and much less may they pawn or sell it. The priest-fellows are to divide between them forty marks, so that none of them

shall have more than forty shillings a-year, in addition to the allowance of food and clothes. It is believed that the actual receipts of these fellows is near £150 a-year at present.

Nearly in all the colleges a similar story is told. Christ Church alone has *no* statutes, and, wonderful to say, seems to need none; as is testified also by Dr. Macbride concerning Magdalen Hall, of which he is principal. It is delightful to discover that reconstruction is needless. But in sober truth, much as we previously knew of the *overthrow* of statutes by law, as a result of the Reformation, and of the neglect of petty enactments which were naturally obsolete, we had no conception, before reading this report, of the extreme liberties which private cupidity has taken with them. The exposure is complete. As the commissioners remark, it is not easy to imagine how the Heads and Fellows can vindicate themselves from the charge of perjury, if they talk broadly of the sacredness of statutes. We think our readers will go farther, and say that any man of really sound conscience, who found he had unawares sworn to obey and cause to be obeyed statutes which now cannot be observed without a violent and destructive revolution in the society, would refrain from administering the oaths to new fellows, when it was manifest that they must be broken, and would publicly seek indemnity for this conduct. If the breach of statutes were less extreme, it might be hopeless to get the assent of the legislature; but we now almost think that even Sir Robert Inglis will cease to talk in parliament about the inviolability of college statutes.

The commissioners advise that all oaths to observe college statutes and all declarations against their change, be prohibited as unlawful. That all fellowships (except a few connected with certain schools) be thrown open to all bachelors of the university; that all fellows be released from the obligation to take holy orders, or proceed to certain higher degrees; and that steps be taken to keep £150 a-year and £300 as the minimum and maximum of fellowships; that any farther surplus be applied to found scholarships; that no scholarships be held for more than five years, and (with certain exceptions) be thrown open to all British subjects; that no scholarships should lead to fellowships without re-election; that the elections be always determined by merit manifested in an examination, and that the electors be either the whole society of fellows, or, in the larger colleges, a board of not fewer than twelve persons; and that a certain number of fellowships be set aside for the encouragement of the new studies brought into the academic system. Of the professor fellows we have already spoken.

Finally: that the head and fellows in each society should

have power (under such control as may be thought expedient) to alter or abrogate statutes, and to frame new statutes as occasion may require.

The claim of 'Founder's Kin' is repudiated by the report on legal grounds. When men have made wills which enact trusteeships for ever, in order to secure money for ever to their posterity, the courts of law have disowned such bequests as 'contrary to public policy.' But it is in principle the very same, if a founder orders his college to keep his property for ever in trust for his kinsmen. So clear is the case, that even without new enactments, it is probable that a college, which sustained a legal action from Founder's Kin, would make good the right to neglect such claims.

Important as is all the above, we still believe that many of our readers are surprised that so enlightened and liberal-minded a commission should overlook entirely the question of admitting dissenters. The truth is, that they were instructed to omit this point; and it is the more creditable that they have said as much as they have in that direction. They express a pointed disapproval of the subscription to the thirty-nine articles, as an obviously improper mode of testing church membership, inasmuch as this subscription is not demanded of the laity, even for the reception of the most solemn rites of religion: and while dissuading this subscription, they disapprove of substituting for it a declaration that one is 'Member of the Church.' Thus they leave the question wholly open. Moreover, they wish a parliamentary sanction given for all the colleges to the practice already (unlawfully, we believe) followed in some, of substituting select and concise prayers for the long and monotonous morning and evening service.

If each separate college had leave to remodel its statutes under some public control, as the report advises, we cannot doubt that, before long, some *one* or *more* would be found to admit dissenters, as in fact is done at Cambridge; and it would be absurd for the other colleges to complain of that.

We think the suggestions of the commissioners will so speak for themselves, that very little comment is needed on our part. It seems to us indisputable, that, in order to carry great academic reforms with the least possible shock and struggle, the parliament ought to give power into the hands of separate colleges wherever there is hope that this will suffice. Oaths to the statutes must be forbidden, because they fetter the collegiate action; and many other of the recommendations of the report would need a parliamentary enactment: but this is not the case in regard to various other matters. Especially con-



sidering the heat excited by religious controversies, it deserves to be considered whether, even as regards the subscription to the thirty-nine articles and conformity to college chapel, the safest and wisest procedure for dissenters is not to claim of parliament that *single* colleges should be empowered, if disposed, to give them relief. That the admission will at last come, we take for granted; how to effect it with the least irritation and ill-will, is a very rightful and Christian problem. We may add, how to effect it in such a form as shall least give to Romanist ambition the opportunity of turning their just freedom and equality into an engine for unscrupulous proselytism. The colleges, if duly armed with power, would more anxiously and sagaciously take precautions against this danger than parliament could be expected to do; and when Oxford studies are more developed, there will be no want of liberality. Already we can predict, there is a good time coming, although the report is hitherto nothing but good advice, which may be neglected.

Its eminent single-heartedness, we feel persuaded, will secure for it the support of those resident academicians who have most influence with thoughtful men in parliament. Already it has quickened the movements of the conservative party in Oxford. New College, one of the most backward colleges, with statutes eminently unsuited to the present day, and glaringly violated, is calling on its 'visitor' to examine and report on its state. This is undoubtedly intended as a defensive measure, to show that they have no desire to conceal anything, and that they are of themselves willing to reform; but we can conceive of no result of such visitation, except an additional impulse to the parliamentary aid which so obviously is needed.

The great deficiency is, a ministry which will move in the matter; and since Lord John is virtually pledged to do so, we cannot but hope that *any* liberal ministry, whoever may be premier, is certain to undertake it. Yet this certainly ought not to make the friends of reform inactive; we know that it does not so in Oxford. The reformers there, we are told, not only understand well the value of the report before us, but are bent to exert themselves vigorously for a real result. Individually they have most to gain by it, though the object is in the highest and truest sense one of national importance. All members of parliament, who call themselves liberal, ought to study the report diligently, and aid its objects perseveringly.

## Brief Notices.

### CONTENTS.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Days of Bruce.</li> <li>2. Sermons on National Subjects.</li> <li>3. Stray Leaves from an Arctic Journal.</li> <li>4. Brittany and the Bible.</li> <li>5. Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews.</li> <li>6. The Families of Holy Scripture.</li> <li>7. Voices of the Dead.</li> <li>8. Castle Deloraine.</li> <li>9. Heroes of the Bible.</li> <li>10. Social Statics.</li> <li>11. Importance of Literature to Men of Business.</li> <li>12. Anshar: a Story of the North.</li> <li>13. Four Gospels Combined. A Monotessaron.</li> <li>14. Sermons Preached at West London Synagogue of British Jews.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Health Made Easy for the People.</li> <li>16. Ezekiel and his Book of Prophecy.</li> <li>17. Rural Economy.</li> <li>18. Instinct and Reason definitively Separated.</li> <li>19. Motives for leaving the Church of Rome.</li> <li>20. New and Popular History of England.</li> <li>21. A Week on the Isles of Scilly.</li> <li>22. The Slingsby Papers.</li> <li>23. The Justified Believer.</li> <li>24. Secret Prayer and its accompanying Exercises.</li> <li>25. Michaud's History of the Crusades.</li> <li>26. Notes of a Mission among the Dens of London.</li> <li>27. Epistle of Paul to the Philippians.</li> </ol> |
|--|---|

*The Days of Bruce; a Story from Scottish History.* By Grace Aquilar.  
London: Groombridge and Son.

THE history of Bruce is, in itself, a romance, and we do not wonder at our northern countrymen being proud of it. It contains many of the highest and most stirring elements of which human life is capable, and constitutes an epoch in the history of Scotland of which her sons may well boast. The present work is an endeavor to place this portion of history before the reader in an instructive and entertaining light, and few efforts have been more successful. We have had an opportunity of observing the interest it awakens in different classes of readers, and in no instance has it failed to rivet attention, and to induce a high estimate of the author's power. We are sorry to learn, from the brief *Preface* of Mrs. Aquilar, that her talented daughter is now beyond the reach of earthly praise. She merited it largely. Her numerous characters are sketched with discrimination and skill; the ever-varying scene on which they acted is painted vividly, and a high tone of morality is maintained throughout. Miss Aquilar was evidently well read in the times of Bruce. She knew its history, and had imbibed largely its spirit, and her sketches of the female actors especially are distinguished by much purity, delicacy, and high-mindedness. It is long since we met with a work which combines so happily the best qualities of historical fiction. The outline is strictly accordant with fact, while the filling-up gives grace and charm to the narrative.

*Sermons on National Subjects, Preached in a Village Church.* By Charles Kingsley. London: Griffin and Co.

THERE is much in this little volume which merits commendation. The sermons are rare examples of simplicity and earnestness. They are evidently what their title imports, and as such, may be studied with advan-

tage by country pastors, whether in the establishment or out of it. We cannot, however, say that they come up to our standard. In manner they are all they should be, but in matter they are deficient. The distinctive truths of the Christian system,—its remedial mercy, the compassionate intervention of the Redeemer, salvation by faith in the atonement, the renewing operation of the Spirit, and the sanctification of man's nature by a believing apprehension of the Saviour, are not as prominent as they should be, and as is absolutely needful, in order that religious teaching should be productive of its legitimate effects. There is much to please, many things to admire, but the vital element of Christian faith is wanting, or at least is not displayed with that distinctness and prominence which is needful to the winning of mankind from the service of sin. We much prefer Mr. Kingsley's companionship as the author of 'Alton Locke' and 'Yeast,' than as a sermonizer. For the former he is admirably qualified, for the latter, he wants some essential ingredients.

---

*Stray Leaves from an Arctic Journal; or, Eighteen Months in the Polar Regions, in Search of Sir John Franklin's Expedition, in the years 1850-51.* By Lieut. Sherard Osborn. London: Longman and Co.

THIS is the production of a seaman, better versed in his profession than in the niceties of authorship. It is written in an off-hand, frank, and intelligent style, and cannot fail to be read with pleasure. 'My motive,' says the author, 'is twofold, to tell of the doings of a screw steam-vessel, the first ever tried in the Polar regions, and by a light readable description of incidents in the late search for Sir John Franklin, to interest the general reader and the community at large upon that subject.' The volume is, of course, mainly employed in detailing the incidents of the voyage, and the narrative is deeply interesting. No opportunity, however, is lost of acquainting the reader with the nature of the regions visited, and the condition and character of the people with whom Lieut. Osborn came in contact. Its value is therefore considerable, and few will regret the time spent in its perusal. It is a pleasant book of light reading, which brings home to the knowledge of all the phenomena, both physical and moral, of a region which few of our countrymen will be tempted to visit.

---

*Brittany and the Bible; with remarks on the French people and their affairs.* By J. Hope. London: Longman and Co.

THIS publication forms No. 23 of 'The Traveller's Library.' We have read it with very considerable pleasure, and can honestly commend it to our readers. It consists of notes written during the author's residence in Brittany, is characterized by much earnestness, and throws light on the habits and religious condition of the Bretons. Mr. Hope draws a melancholy, yet we fear a truthful, picture of the general state of the French people. It is not, however, all dark. There are some bright colors—not many, indeed, yet enough to convince us of what may be looked for when the sanitary influences of religious truth are widely circulated. We are glad to find such a work in Messrs. Longman's series, and doubt not its being welcomed by a large class of readers.



*Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Hebrews.* By Arthur Pridham, Author of 'Notes and Reflections on the Epistle to the Romans,' 'Notes and Reflections on the Psalms.' Bath: Binns and Goodwin. London: Whittaker and Co.; Nisbet and Co., 1852.

WE are always thankful for the fruits of thoughtful examination of particular books of scripture. Mr. Pridham is a careful writer and eminently evangelical. He has paid much attention to the neglected topic of the divine dispensations, and though some readers may object to what are commonly called 'Millennarian Views' in his volume, we do not hesitate to speak of it in general terms of commendation, because we happen to have views of our own relating to the connexion of the dispensation under which we are living, and *that* which, being yet future, precludes, as we think, the formation of any dogmatic judgment, and exposes the confident expression of opinion, on several sides, to the suspicion of rashness and party bias. We believe that the judicious and spiritual reader will find this volume very helpful in the study of the remarkable Epistle on which it is written.

---

*The Families of Holy Scripture.* By Charles Larom. London: Houlston and Stoneman. 1852.

A PLEASING little book, by a very amiable writer, which will be read with interest by heads of families. Our neutral position disqualifies us for making any observation on a few passages suggestive of controversy, while it requires us simply to notify that there are such passages.

---

*Voices of the Dead.* By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown-court, Covent Garden, Author of 'Voices of the Night,' 'Voices of the Day,' &c., &c. Third Thousand. London: J. F. Shaw; Hall, Virtue, and Co. 1852.

WE have copied Dr. Cumming's title-page, as somewhat entertaining, as introducing a gentleman who *twice over* tells his reader that he preaches to 'seventeen hundred people,' and that if he prints a sermon it is to be read by 'seventeen thousand people.' We suppose this volume consists of seventeen such sermons, and that they have been reported verbatim, with the corrections necessary to substitute the chapter for the sermon, and with the prefixes of poetry which, it may be presumed, were neither 'said nor sung' in the pulpit. We have no desire, and no power, to prevent these brilliant discourses being read by the thousands of the eloquent preacher's admirers, not only in these islands and the United States, but, as he tells us, his sermons are read in 'India, Australia, and the continent,' on which important fact we frankly tender him our felicitations. Writing critically, we are free to say that we desiderate greater accuracy in scientific allusions, less repetition, greater chasteness of imagery, and more *food for thought*. We have observed several minute contradictions which pass unnoticed in the rapid delivery of the speaker, but which cannot be concealed in a book. We think there is a difference between an extemporaneous discourse, and a chapter in a printed volume,

which it is inconvenient to overlook. The *cacoethes scribendi* is not exactly the description of Dr. Cumming's passion, but the *cacoethes publicandi*. It is no affair of ours that wealthy people should gratify their taste in such matters; but we demur to considering this volume as belonging strictly to the *literature* of our language. At the same time we cheerfully accord to every man the right to do good in his own way, and to make the best use he can of popularity. We do not think that any man can long be popular in a London pulpit without deserving it; but we confess to a certain squeamishness about any appearance of clerical solicitude in courting it, and turning it, in a worldly sense, to good account. So excellent a preacher as Dr. Cumming has no occasion to give such an impression, and we trust that so good a Christian will allow us to express freely our dislike, in religious circles, of what our friends in Germany express by a word for which we have no English—*aufschneiderei*.

---

*Castle Deloraine; or, The Ruined Peer.* By Maria Priscilla Smith. In Three Volumes. London: Bentley. 1851.

THESE volumes have a taking title, and a startling tale, well conceived, and told with much vivacity. The moral is not to our taste; and the long discussions in favour of communistic doctrines are not the less wearisome for being contrary to our convictions of truth. While we admire the tact and power of the authoress, and sympathise with many of her aspirations, we hold our Christian belief too strongly to be carried away by the dreamy philosophy of Ferrers Hartwell, or to be edified with the death-bed scene of Harry Thornton.

---

*Heroes of the Bible; or, Sketches of Scripture Characters.* By W. T. Edwards, Congregational Chapel, City Road. London: John Snow, 1852.

SINCE the publication of Robinson's 'Scripture Characters,' and Hunter's 'Sacred Biography,' we have had few works of the same order, with the exception of Dr. Cox's, of which a second edition was noticed in our last Number. We have often sketched, in thought, a plan somewhat different from those adopted by the writers to whom we have now referred, as well as by Mr. Edwards. Of the 'Heroes of the Bible,' we can only say, that, without any pretensions to originality of thought or richness of illustration, it is a good specimen of pulpit instruction—brief—lively—serious—scriptural in its tone, and eminently practical in its application.

---

*Social Statics; or, The Conditions Essential to Human Happiness specified, and the first of them developed.* By Herbert Spencer. London: John Chapman. 1851.

THIS is a remarkably lucid and well-sustained exposition of one simple principle in most of its logical consequences. The author begins with a brief but smart dissection of the doctrine of expediency, especially in the form given to it by Jeremy Bentham in his principle of 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number,' during which he exposes the fallacy of assuming that men are agreed on either the definition of happiness, or the

methods by which it is to be attained, and the kindred fallacy of imagining that the stage of human civilization implied in government is the normal and permanent condition of man. The writer has not burdened himself with the consideration of the *historical* development of the social life, which is the only philosophical method of treatment. He can no more construct society on abstract theories than he can create planets. We look with distrust on all works of this description as likely to encourage the recklessness of innovation; at the same time, we acknowledge that many of the principles asserted are solid, and the inferences drawn from them are fair; only there are many other principles equally solid, of which this writer takes no cognizance, from which different conclusions, not less logical and cogent, might be drawn.

---

*The Importance of Literature to Men of Business.* A series of Addresses delivered at various Popular Institutions. Revised and Corrected by the Authors. London: Griffin and Co. 1852.

THESE addresses are by the following eminent persons:—G. O. C. Verplanck, Esq. (New York); Sir J. F. W. Herschel, Bart.; Right Hon. B. Disraeli; Lord John Manners; The Hon. G. Sydney Smythe; Sir T. N. Talfourd; Professor Philips; the Earl of Carlisle; Archbishop Whately; Charles Knight, Esq.; Lord Mahon; Professor Nichol; the Duke of Argyll; Sir David Brewster; and Henry Glassford Bell, Esq. As might be presumed, they are of varied interest, and abound in local references; but we know not any class of readers to whom they will not be deservedly welcome. They derive most of their interest from the reputation of the several speakers, and they set forth the themes of science and literature with a healthy freshness seldom found in more formal publications.

---

*Anschar: a Story of the North.* London: Parker.

It would be a great blessing for writers and readers, if nine-tenths of our authors of fiction or historical stories were put under a 'gagging act,' and half of the other tenth forced to write what did occur, instead of what might, could, would, or should, have occurred. Here, for instance, is a gentleman, who is evidently well read in the history of the period he lays his tale in; but instead of writing what his acquirements would well fit him for—a life of the great Anschar, the apostle of Christianity in Sweden, by which he would do a service to our scantily-furnished shelves of ecclesiastical history—he must needs try to write what he is not fitted for—a story founded on the life—by which he only weakens the interest of the history, and gives us a second-rate, pale, colorless tale.

The author is evidently thoroughly at home in his subject, as far as student familiarity is concerned. The accessories, dresses, and decorations, are all quite correct; giant berserkirs, pirate Northmen, priestesses, runes, chaunts, Odin, Freya, althing, and all the rest of it, are here; but somehow, like Pharaoh's chariots, 'they drive heavily.' The characters are but unsubstantial personages after all; and though a scene or two are spirited, yet the whole surrenders the perpetually interesting power of real history without attaining the poet's power of the truer truth—the perfect fiction.



*The Four Gospels Combined; or, the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as narrated by the four Evangelists; being a Chronological Arrangement of the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; in the words of Holy Scripture, according to the authorized version, without any additions, and omitting repetitions only.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.; and W. Adams and Co. 1850.

*A Monotessaron; or, the Gospel Records of the Life of Christ, combined into one Narrative, on the basis of Dr. Carpenter's Apostolic Harmony. Edited by Russel Lant Carpenter, B.A.* London: S. T. Whitfield. 1851.

WE have read each of these harmonies with much interest. Dr. Carpenter's differs from the former, which is anonymous, in occasional departures from the received version, in brief explanatory notes, and in what appears to be a more elaborate arrangement, and in a lucid exhibition of that arrangement in analytic sections, drawn up in a tabular form. We do not find any indication, in either the one or the other, of a theological bias. The former work is the more elegant in appearance; the latter more likely to assist the reader in a somewhat exact and critical understanding of the Gospels. We commend them both as laudable attempts to help the Christian student in the most interesting, as well as sacred, of studies, by presenting to him the 'Life' which, beyond others, is full of heavenly truth, which is the perfection of human goodness, and the brightest manifestation of the one living and true God.

---

*Sermons Preached on various occasions at the West London Synagogue of British Jews.* By the Rev. D. W. Marks, Minister of the Congregation; published at the request of the Council of Founders. London: Groombridge and Sons. A. M. 5711—A. D. 1851.

THESE sermons are respectable as compositions, and valuable as conveying a large amount of useful instruction. Their chief and proper interest, however, lies in their being an exposition of the doctrines held by men sustaining towards the Hebrew faith a relation like that of Protestants towards the Catholic church; that is, they reject the traditions of the elders, and hold fast by the Scriptures. Of course, the Christian reader regrets the absence of that faith which we believe to have animated the ancient Hebrews, and which is consummated in the teaching of Messiah. Nevertheless, there is much in these discourses which is worthy of attention on the part of Christians as well as Israelites. The movement of which they are a sign and an exposition is of great importance both in England and on the European continent, and one in which, so far as it reaches, we cannot but rejoice, while we hope it is but the precursor of one immeasurably more spiritual and glorious. We tender the reverend author of the volume our thanks for so precious a contribution to our sacred literature.

---

*Health made easy for the People; or Physical Training to make their Lives in this world Long and Happy.* By Joseph Bentley. London: Joseph Bentley. 1851.

A sensible and useful book.

N. S.—VOL. IV.

*Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy; an Exposition.* By the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, Salton, author of 'Typology of Scripture,' 'Jonah,' &c. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1851.

WE feel as though we were not doing justice to so large and so well studied a work as this by merely a 'brief notice;' and indeed we have been waiting for an opportunity of devoting to it, as it deserves, several pages of review; but as we are unwilling to keep back any longer a volume so important, we feel that we are better fulfilling our own sense of duty when we yield to the necessity of choosing between brevity and delay. Mr. Fairbairn has mastered the literature of his subject; is familiar with Greenhill and Newcombe, with Radus and Villalpandus, with Calvin, Rosenmüller, and Maurer, with Ewald, Hävernicks, and Witzig, and Hengstenberg; he has entered profoundly into the idiosyncrasies of Ezekiel's mental character; his imaginativeness, his sensuousness, his 'fleshy eye'; his love of strong painting and symbolical expression; he has seen the worth of such a prophet in the peculiar circumstances of his ministry among exiles and captives, while Daniel was directing the movements of an empire; he has seized the salient points of character and position which gave their tone to the composition; and has pondered the gorgeous visions of inspiration with learning, wisdom, devotion, and reverential love. We do not go along with him in all his expositions; yet, when we differ from him, it is with hesitation and unfeigned respect. We entirely concur in his views of the Vision of the Dry Bones, and of the Assault of Gog and Magog; and his dealing with the last eight chapters is the most satisfactory we have ever read. We prize the 'Exposition' very highly, as one which both vindicates and illustrates some of the principles of prophetic interpretation, which have been so grievously violated in a very large portion of books professing to foretell the future course of our world's outward history, by converting the symbols of poetry into the actual anticipation of events. We look on Mr. Fairbairn as a good expounder of the literal sense of the words of this inspired prophet.

---

*Rural Economy for Cottage Farmers and Gardeners; a Treasury of Information on Cow Keeping, Sheep, Pigs, Poultry, the Horse, Pony, Ass, Goat, Honey Bee, etc., etc., etc.* By Martin Doyle and others. London: Groombridge and Sons.

A USEFUL reprint, with additions, of the principal articles on rural economy in the 'Family Economist.' The very title is refreshing to us amid the urban labours of literature; and we know enough of country life to be satisfied that the practical advices here given are among the best things that can be said to persons of the class for which they are intended.

---

*Instinct and Reason Definitively Separated;* and, consequently, including an answer to 'The Vexata Quæstio of Brute Reasoning,' which has so long perplexed the ablest writers on that important point, by Gordonius. London: Effingham Wilson. 1852.

A really clever performance, which will amply repay perusal.

*An Exposition of the Principal Motives which induced me to leave the Church of Rome.* By C. L. Tuvier, formerly a Roman Catholic Priest. Translated from the French, by A. S. Busby. London: Bosworth, 1851.

THE writer is now the Protestant Minister at Clermont-Ferrand, Puy-de-Dôme, Auvergne, much esteemed by the Evangelical clergy of France. We commend it to our readers as the personal testimony and the enlightened defence of an intelligent and earnest convert to the Bible.

*New and Popular History of England.* By Robert Ferguson, L.L.D. In four volumes. London: J. Cassell. 1851.

THESE volumes are well written. They bring the history down to the year 1850. We are glad to find so much accurate information combined with principles so enlightened brought within the reach of the many. It is an undertaking which deserves all the encouragement it can receive.

*A Week on the Isles of Scilly.* By J. W. North, M.A., Chaplain. Penzance: Rowe and Son. London: Longmans.

A VERY intelligent, entertaining, and useful companion for tourists in the beautiful islands, which we commend to the attention of our readers who have leisure for excursions in the approaching summer. We omitted to notice it last year, because the grand attraction of the Crystal Palace interfered with our purpose. The volume will, however, be found both instructive and entertaining to those who are obliged to make their excursions on the wings of imagination. It tells them all about the topography, history, antiquities, statistics, and natural history of islands which, though but a few hours sail from Penzance, are less known, probably, to Englishmen than those of the Antilles or the Pacific.

*The Slingsby Papers: A Selection from the Writings of Jonathan Freke Slingsby.* Dublin: M'Glashan. London: Orr and Co. 1852.

THIS agreeable volume belongs to a series of 'Readings in Popular Literature.' The papers it contains are reprinted from the 'Dublin University Magazine,' which were much commended, not in Ireland only, but in Great Britain and America. They are written in a lively and somewhat brilliant style on the following attractive topics:—The Slingsbyan—General Thoughts on Christmas—Christmas Day at Castle Slingsby—Thoughts on the Old Year—The Old Year and the New—The Bells of St. Bruno—Twelfth Day; or, the Last of our Holidays—St. Valentine's Day—A Legend of St. Valentine—St. Patrick's Day in my own Parlour. The Selection is a wholesome addition to the many cheap publications for popular and family reading.

*The Justified Believer; his Security, Conflicts, and Triumphs.* By W. B. Mackenzie, M.A., Incumbent of St. James', Holloway. A new edition. London: Religious Tract Society.

A JUDICIOUS, practical, and highly Scriptural treatise on a vital aspect of the Christian faith, seasonable at all times, and adapted to all capacities and to every class.



*Secret Prayer and its accompanying Exercises.* By Rev. James M'Gill.  
Glasgow : Bryce.

THIS little book is one that you cannot read for the purpose of writing a notice of it. The class of works to which it belongs—the devotional—are not meant to be criticized, but to be felt; and we should as soon think of taking a good man's prayers to review as of coming to such a volume for that purpose. We can only say of the present treatise that it is eminently practical and prayerful, simple and earnest; likely, therefore, to be peculiarly acceptable to the large class who seek in their reading for stimulus to their religious life from the affectionate reiteration in familiar words of familiar truths.

*Michaud's History of the Crusades.* Translated from the French, by W. Robson. In three volumes. Vols. I. and II. London : George Routledge and Co.

THIS is an excellent translation of the best history of the Crusades which European literature has supplied. Considering the great value of the work, and the high reputation it bears on the Continent, we are much surprised that it has not been previously introduced to the English reader. We are at a loss to account for the fact, and congratulate our countrymen that it makes its appearance at length in so authentic a form, and at so low a price. The translator and publishers are entitled to our best thanks for having catered so well for our instruction and entertainment. Michaud's History is the most complete record of the Crusades yet given to Europe. It distances all competitors, and leaves no hope of a superior. In the words of the author's biographer, 'It may be said without exaggeration, that it is one of the most valuable historical works that our age has produced. To its completion he sacrificed almost every moment of twenty of the last years of his life.' By issuing it in a cheap but neat form, the Messrs. Routledge have increased the obligation conferred on the public; and we shall be glad to learn that they have been amply remunerated. Two volumes of the work are already published; a third is to follow; and we strongly recommend all our readers—the young especially—to give to its pages an early and attentive perusal.

*Notes and Narratives of a Six Years' Mission, principally amongst the Dens of London.* By R. W. Vanderkiste, late London City Missionary.  
London : Nisbet and Co.

THIS small volume contains the unostentatious record of a city missionary's daily life. They who doubt the wretchedness, ignorance, brutality, and vice which abound in London, or are sceptical as to the good effected by religious agencies, will do well to consult its pages. It is a touching record which all may peruse with advantage, and from which some lessons of great practical value may be derived. The power of religious truth to purify and elevate the most criminal, is shown in the form best adapted to set incredulity at defiance.

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH. 249

*The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians, and the General Epistle of James, Practically and Historically Explained.* By Augustus Neander. To which is added, A Discourse on the Coming of the Lord, and its Signs. By the same Author. Translated from the German, by the Rev. Alexander Napier, M.A., Vicar of Holkham, Norfolk. Edinburgh. T. and T. Clark. 1851.

WE hail the appearance of these minor works of the illustrious and ever-to-be-lamented German ecclesiastical historian. The more intimate the acquaintance of our ministers and theological students with the thoughts of this great man, the sounder and healthier will be their theological opinions. It is well to have the old and much-loved presented in a new terminology, and we welcome the introduction among us in an English dress of this explication of the Epistle to the Philippians, and that of St. James, because we find here new views of truth. We have not leisure to make an accurate comparison of the translation with the German, but we have no doubt, from the rank and standing of the author, that it is creditably performed. Those portions of the community who are devoted to theological pursuits in this country are under considerable obligation to the Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh for introducing to the public notice some admirable translations of the late works on biblical science in Germany; and chiefly for bringing within the reach of, we hope we may say, all our students the invaluable writings of Dr. Neander, one of the most powerful thinkers and most successful writers of modern times. We shall be glad to hear that this neat little volume has met with a large and remunerative sale in this country, and that it has become a favourite with them who have not the privilege of acquainting themselves with the author in his own language.

---

### Review of the Month.

THE PAST HAS BEEN A BUSY MONTH. We have been immersed in the turmoil and excitement of a general election. This has been the one topic about which men have conversed, meet when and where they might. The ordinary occupations of life have been for the moment disregarded. The one engrossing theme has called off attention, and we have been elated or depressed according to the triumph or defeat of our favorite candidates. To the hangers-on of party the past month must have been a terrible time. The Tapers and Tadpoles, tory or whig—must have had a miserable season of it during this sultry July. Well, the elections are now generally over. Before this sheet meets the eye of our readers, the contest will have terminated, and the fate of the Derby ministry, whether for evil or for good, will be sealed. On both sides calculations are being made; losses and gains are counted up; and, what some perhaps will deem strange, the shout of victory is heard from both camps. Buonaparte is

reported to have said that English soldiers did not know when they were beaten. It is so with English citizens. In civil as in martial contests John Bull is no believer in his own defeat. He seems scarcely to credit its possibility; and merriment and revelry are therefore often heard when impartial bystanders suspect that other sounds might best become him. Something of this sort is occurring just now, unless we adopt the hypothesis—to which we are disinclined—that one or other of the two great parties is wilfully seeking to mislead the public. It may be so; but we believe that the facts of the case are to be accounted for on other and more honorable grounds. The discrepancy in the reports of various journals is very glaring, and may well deter from any dogmatic judgment. The 'Morning Chronicle,' for instance, some days since calculated the ministerial returns up to the 16th at 192, and the non-ministerialists at 284; thus giving to the *latter* a majority of 92. The 'Morning Herald,' on the other hand, computing the ministerial returns at 244, and their opponents at 242, gave to the *former* a majority of 2. The 'Daily News,' reporting the liberals at 266, and the Derbyites and Peelites together at 222, gives a majority against ministers of 44; while the 'Times,' ranking 238 only as liberals, and 244 as ministerialists and liberal conservatives, gives the government a majority of 6.

Amidst such discrepancies, it is sheer folly to attempt any minute calculation. The time is not yet come to ascertain the precise result. The ambiguous professions of many candidates render it impossible to determine their position; while the return of nearly sixty who are termed *liberal conservatives*, as distinct from ministerialists on the one hand and from liberals on the other, introduces an element which precludes the possibility of exact and certain classification. According to the point of view from which such returns are regarded, will be the estimate formed of the relative strength of the ministry and its opponents. On some questions—free trade, for instance—liberal conservatives will rank with the opposition; but on others, and those neither unimportant nor few, they will be amongst the foremost opponents of reforming measures. It were folly to expect Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Gladstone, and others of the same class, to be frequently associated with Messrs. Hume, Cobden, and Bright. We must know a little more of the temper and policy of the men in question before we venture to predict their adhesion to the cause of the people. While, however, we cautiously abstain from premature triumph, it may be possible to make an approximation to the truth. We may not yet be able to ascertain with certainty the precise result, but we may learn so much as will assure us of the general course and tendency of coming events. To this, therefore, we address ourselves, and so far as we are conscious, with an honest desire to know the facts of the case. It is in no spirit of partizanship that we prosecute the inquiry. To permit our judgments to be swayed by any such spirit would be sheer folly; for, apart from all other considerations, the truth must soon be known. Men's votes will best explain their views. This criterion will dispel all illusions, and it is in vain for journalists to prophesy falsely during the brief period which elapses before the *House* meets. We have been at considerable pains to scrutinize the various reports which are afloat, and, on the whole, are disposed to



place most reliance on the following statement taken from the 'Examiner' of the 24th. It is calculated up to Friday, the 23rd, and does not include the Peelites or liberal tories as a section of the liberal party.

	Liberal gain.	Tory gain.
I. English boroughs . . . . .	33	33
II. English counties . . . . .	1	10
III. Welsh boroughs . . . . .	1	2
IV. Welsh counties . . . . .	1	—
V. Scotch boroughs . . . . .	—	—
VI. Scotch counties . . . . .	—	1
VII. Irish boroughs . . . . .	3	4
VIII. Irish counties . . . . .	2	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	41	51
		<hr/>
		41
		<hr/>
Net gain of seats to Tories . . . . .		10

Narrowness of space has compelled us to abridge this statement; but if it represents, with substantial correctness, the results of the elections—and on this point we have no doubt—then one thing is evident; the commercial policy of 1846 is free from danger, but the reform party has failed to obtain that accession to its numbers which would enable it to pursue a bold and comprehensive policy. Lord Derby has made an appeal to the country on the bread-tax question, and the response given is clear, unequivocal, and most decisive. On other points, a more dubious reply is rendered, and it would not be difficult—were it germane to our present object—to point out the reason of its being so.

There has been much attempt at mystification on the part of ministers. Before coming into office their rallying cry was *protection*; and when they gained possession of the treasury benches in February last, Lord Derby admitted that he was prevented from carrying out his views by a hostile majority in the Lower House. Against this majority he proposed to appeal to the country, and he was at first evidently sanguine as to the result. His lordship, however, soon found that the people were against him; and the special arts of Mr. Disraeli have been from that moment employed to throw dust into the popular eye. Democracy, the Church, Maynooth, Protestantism, and a hundred other things have been talked of, with the obvious design of withdrawing the obnoxious theme. The disreputable artifice has been adopted by the party, until at length, as if by universal consent, scarcely a voice was heard to whisper the dogma to which they had sworn fealty. It is strange to notice the length to which party trickery can go. We can respect a protectionist though we think him wrong. The honesty of the man makes some amends for the error of his creed. But we know no terms in which adequately to express our reprobation of the policy which, under other pretences, and with an affected liberality of speech, really contemplates the pecuniary interests of the few at the cost of the many. There is something generous in an advocacy of the poor when their interests are supposed to clash with those of the rich; but the nominee of the landlord, the pleader for a tax on bread, is the ally of the rich and the powerful in oppressing the poor and the weak.

In the present case hypocrisy has been added to injustice. Fair words and vague promises have been employed to delude a confiding people. 'I always thought,' said Mr. Cobden, at Wakefield, and there was terrible irony in his words, 'from the year 1846 down to last year, and even up to the beginning of this year, that the leader of the protectionist party in the House of Commons was a protectionist. I thought he meant by "protection," not merely a tax upon corn for the protection of the agriculturist; I thought he meant protection to all interests in the country—protection to shipping, protection to manufactures, protection to sugar, protection to the colonies. That was what I understood by the principle of protection. I thought as a freetrader I had been opposing a party who had a principle, and that that principle was opposed to free trade. But I see the tone altogether changed now, and changed in a way to expose, I think, the selfishness, the undisguised selfishness of the party, who are now advocating a change of taxation for the benefit of particular interests.' Mr. Cobden, it seems, was mistaken, and so, indeed, were all other men:—the Duke of Richmond equally with the member for the West Riding, the House of Lords as well as the House of Commons, the agriculturists of the three kingdoms as much as the manufacturers of Lancashire and York. Strange, this universal blunder. Had it been limited to one party, it might not have defied solution; but as it pervades all classes, is found in the palace equally with the cottage; is proclaimed triumphantly by the lordling and admitted with sorrow by the laborer; causing the farmer to exult in the prospect of artificial profits, and the merchant to despond in the contraction of his engagements; we know no principle on which it can be explained,—no rule by which it can be harmonized with fact. And yet, amidst the *arcana* of the universe, such rule must be, or we are driven to a conclusion which we are unwilling to admit, even in the case of Lord Derby's government, bad as we think of its *morale*. Who would have expected from the bitter and unscrupulous assailant of Sir Robert Peel, such words as the following:—'We have been taunted to-day with the question of "Are you a freetrader, or are you not?" I am almost surprised that the big and the little loaf did not appear in the procession of the gentlemen opposite. The time has gone by when these exploded politics could interest the people of this country. No one supposes that the present administration have any intention, or ever had any intention, to bring back the laws that were repealed in 1846.' And yet these very words were spoken by Mr. Disraeli at his nomination on the 16th. A grosser insult was never offered to an English assembly; and if, at Aylesbury, they induced any other feeling than that of contemptuous indignation, the intellect of Buckinghamshire must be low indeed. One thing, however, is evident, protection is abandoned even by its sworn advocates. It has no chance of revisiting the abodes of the living. The *liberal conservatives* to a man are pledged against it; a large proportion of the borough members in the ministerial camp are sworn to oppose it, and even some of the county members are bound hand and foot. We have before us the address of the ministerial candidates for East Surrey, dated July 5th, in which they beg 'distinctly to state' that they 'are opposed to the reimposition of ANY duty on the importation of corn.' So hopeless is the case that Mr. Newdegate promises not to divide his party again respecting it. His

language is plaintive—somewhat penitential—but it speaks volumes. It is an acknowledgment of defeat so absolute as to preclude the possibility of resurrection. Mr. Denison might well tell his constituents '*the question of protection is at last gone and dead.*' Moralists are accustomed to say that truth only is consistent; and we need not, therefore, marvel that some discrepancies are visible in the responses of the ministerial oracle. While the Chancellor of the Exchequer repudiates protection, and the son of the premier assures us that nothing of the kind is contemplated, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Mr. Christopher, affirms, '*I say the government have no intention of abandoning protection, and, therefore, I support the government.*' Well, we shall soon see. Parliament will probably meet in November, and the views of ministers may then be brought to a clear and determinate issue. In the meantime we have no fear. Let justice be done to all classes, but favor shown to none.

The question of protection being settled, a clear stage is afforded for the consideration of other matters, and here, we confess to much solicitude. The state of parties cannot be viewed with entire complacency; it is hopeful, but nothing more; it awakens expectation, but gives no very satisfactory promise; it betokens a different state of things from that which existed in the times of our fathers; but it summons to labor, to conflict, it may be, to a protracted struggle, rather than to an easy and early triumph. The cohesion of party is gone. Great names and great families have lost their influence. Territorial possessions may give local power, but the national will refuses to follow, save where the national interests are consulted. A new order of political elements is introduced, and the most far-seeing and sagacious are at fault in calculating its tendency. This is especially seen—and for obvious reasons—in the reform party. The whigs no longer occupy the place they did in the days of Fox and Grey. We are not unmindful of their services, nor are we inclined to attribute them to the most questionable motives possible. Leaving, however, the past, we look to the present state of the whig party, and here we see the great difficulty with which reformers have to contend. No sooner will parliament meet than we shall hear much of the need of union, the responsibility incurred by dividing reformers, the necessity of each man abandoning his crotchet, the expediency and the obligation of adopting some common ground on which all may rally. If such language be interpreted by the past, it means simply that the views of the more moderate and aristocratic liberals should be adopted as the Shibboleth of the party. If such, however, be its meaning, it must be utterly and for ever eschewed. There must be give and take. Each section of reformers must yield something to the other. Concession must not be all on one side. If the men of progress check their speed, and consent to proceed at a slower pace, their titled associates must bestir themselves somewhat; shake off their inertness; and consent to win the people's triumph, by conceding the people's measures. The state of the liberal party is clearly unsatisfactory. Lord John has not the confidence of very many of his followers. Disguise it as we may, the fact is notorious, and it was exhibited most mortifyingly during the latter years of his lordship's premiership. It was not an uncommon thing to see him triumphing over the most consistent and veteran liberals by aid borrowed



from the tory camp. These things must not be repeated. Great injury has already accrued from them, and in the new parliament we must have an entire change. Either Lord John must abandon his position as leader of the liberal party, or he must adopt a policy which shall satisfy the great majority of his followers. Things have come to such a pass, that harmony between the people and their political chiefs must be secured. Without this we are at the mercy of our opponents; but let us have it, and we throw fear to the wind. We do not ask that Lord John and the whigs should go all lengths with us. This would be as unreasonable as the demand they have made on us. But we do ask that such a programme should be issued as will suffice to awaken popular enthusiasm, and thus give to a liberal government the strength required for the carrying of their measures. To descend to particulars, three things appear to us absolutely needful.

First, *There must be an infusion of new men into the government.* The cliqueship of the whigs must be abandoned. When the people were less enlightened, it may have been needful, but the case is different now. They are competent to the management of their own affairs, and feel insulted by the theory on which their leaders act. Let us have men of the nobility by all means, but let them be associated with others reared amongst the people, and practically acquainted with their wants. This association must be on terms of equality and mutual respect. Let the men most fitted for office, whether titled or not, occupy the higher posts of the state.

Again, *There must be a large extension of the suffrage.* The present state of the constituency is a disgrace to the liberal party. It is only a fraction of the population which is entrusted with a vote, while all are required to contribute to the support of the state. Taxation and representation ought, in our judgment, to be coextensive; but if this is making too large a demand on the Whigs, let them meet us on the medium ground of household suffrage.

But again, *We must have the ballot.* Without this we do not believe that any other measure will be efficacious. The complaint of intimidation is universal. Even Sir George Grey encountered it in Northumberland, and the loss of his seat has been the consequence. In the recent elections it has been far more general than bribery. Bribery, however, has been freely resorted to where impunity was calculated on. Witness the case of Derby, with the mysterious letter, bearing the Carlton Club seal, and the initials W. B. Major Beresford denies—not, be it remembered—the writing of this letter, but the practice of bribing. If his denial be not worth more than his statements respecting the ‘Morning Chronicle,’ it will not avail him much. Men have feared to practice bribery because the law stood ready to punish the misdeed, but where is the legal agency by which coercion can be prevented? ‘The immense majority of the population in Wales,’ said Mr. Cobden at Wakefield, ‘were dissenters and liberals, verging almost to radicalism; yet there was the glaring fact that the great majority of members returned for Wales were churchmen and high tories. What greater proof could there be that the people having votes were not allowed to exercise them as freely as they ought?’ These elections, instead of being scenes of popular

elevation, evinced in the exercise of a great popular right, were periodical scourges afflicting the rank and file of the liberal party, with not merely the greatest evils which they could labour under as politicians—not merely depriving them of the use of a franchise, but sinking them in moral and social degradation, putting them to torture, and inflicting positive losses and wrong on them. . . . If there was to be any enthusiasm excited among the old liberal party, he did think that the heads of that party (the parliamentary chiefs—the statesmen of the party) must be prepared to look this question of the exercise of the franchise fairly in the face, and devise means by which an extension of the franchise should not be made an extended curse to the great body of the liberal party.’ We rejoice in these words. Rumor points out the speaker as destined to take part in the next liberal government, and we hold him to the pledge thus virtually given. Every day convinces us, yet more and more, that the ballot is absolutely needful to the purity and independence of the electoral body.

The return of several protestant dissenters is a marked feature of the recent elections, on some of the bearings of which we should be glad to enlarge, if our space permitted. A few had seats in the late parliament, but their number is now considerably increased by the addition of Sir J. Anderson for the Stirling district, Mr. Alderman Challis for Finsbury, Messrs. Ball for Cambridgeshire, Barnes for Bolton, T. Chambers for Hertford, Cheetham for South Lancashire, Crossley for Halifax, Sir George Goodman for Leeds, Messrs. Hadfield for Sheffield, and Miall for Rochdale. With a solitary exception, these gentlemen will be found in the foremost ranks of reform.\* Protection, like toryism, finds little favor amongst dissenters, nor can its advocacy long coexist with the large and catholic spirit which genuine dissenterism inspires.

We rejoice in the return of these gentlemen. Their presence in the British legislature is a sign of the times which thoughtful men will ponder, and from which the philosophic statesman may learn the change that is passing over the public mind. Much will depend—so far as religious liberty is concerned—on the course they pursue. Their first object should be to gain a thorough knowledge of the usages and practice of the House, and then to avail themselves of every opportunity to correct prevalent misconceptions, to expose sophistry, to lay bare the working of the state-church, and to render palpable the fact, that Christianity and the hierarchy are not identical. They must be content for a time to be the pioneers of truth. There is a vast amount of error to be corrected; and this will be best done by watching the course of parliamentary debates with a vigilance that never tires, and an intelligence that commands respect. Especially should they avoid prematurely committing themselves to any substantive proposition. The legislature is not prepared for this, and they must, therefore, be content, for a time, to feel their way, until sounder views

---

\* The ‘Patriot’ of the 26th is, we believe, in error, in classing Mr. Ball with the baptists. If we mistake not he is a member of the Congregational Church at Burwell, and is himself a pædo-baptist. Of the sincerity and earnestness of his political course no doubt will be entertained by those who know him.



256

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH.

are prevalent, or a practical case calls for the interference of parliament. Their position requires discretion as well as earnestness. There is a large amount of work ready to their hands; and if this be done well, they will indoctrinate the public mind with other views than churchmen have propounded, and thus prepare the way for the disenthralment of religion from state patronage and control. An intelligent and able exposition of the evils resulting from the established system, and of the competency of Christianity to maintain itself, is the great want of the day, and we rejoice to believe that it is now in the way of being supplied.

Many things have occurred in the course of the elections on which we should like to dwell, but we are compelled to restrict ourselves to two or three. The Norwich election is especially note-worthy. Popular enthusiasm attained its height in that city. The liberal candidates, Messrs. Peto and Warner, threw themselves on the people, and their confidence was nobly rewarded. There was no concealment or mystification about them. They spoke as they felt, and their words went direct, and with vast power, to the hearts of the people. The contrast between them and their opponents in this respect was most striking. The one courted, and the other shrunk from, the people. Messrs. Peto and Warner were frequently in public. They addressed large assemblies, and were everywhere, and at all times, received with enthusiasm. On the other hand, the Marquis of Douro and Colonel Dickson did not hold a single *public* meeting, and made no other avowal of their political faith than that of confidence in Lord Derby's government. The result was such as might have been anticipated. The Marquis of Douro, eldest son of the Duke of Wellington, is displaced from the seat which he has occupied for fourteen years, and Messrs. Peto and Warner are now the representatives for Norwich. 'It is to us,' says the 'Norfolk News' of the 17th, 'a source of inexpressible gratification that this great triumph has been achieved by the energy and enthusiasm of the entire population—that it has been, in fact, the people's work—that they have won the battle—and that to them the glory of the victory belongs. Never was so large a population so stirred up. Through every street, and from every lane and alley, the shout echoed and re-echoed, 'Peto and Warner!' 'Peto and Warner for ever!' Every man, every woman, and every child, seemed animated by the same overwhelming zeal. The city has been redeemed, and the people have done it.' The return of the liberal candidates was triumphant, the numbers at the close of the poll being,

Mr. Peto	2190
Mr. Warner	2145
Marquis of Douro	1592
Lieut. Colonel Dickson	1465

But this was not all. The contest was distinguished by other and still more gratifying features. The electioneering reputation of Norwich has been at a sad discount. We have heard strange tales of the doings of the 'old city' in days that are passed. Such things are scarcely to be credited now. They are happily matters of history, and what has recently taken place will help to prevent their recurrence. For the first time, probably,



a Norwich election has been conducted with purity; and this is owing, be it remembered, to the earnestness of the people on the one hand, and to the virtuous resolve of the candidates on the other. Appealing to the intelligence and political integrity of the constituency, Messrs. Peto and Warner pledged themselves to offer no bribe, and to attempt no intimidation. Fears were at first entertained that the tory party, in order to counteract the enthusiasm of the people, would betake themselves to the corrupt practices of former times; but the precautionary measures adopted prevented the possibility of their doing so, and thus saved the city from the debasing influences which might otherwise have been brought to bear upon it. The non-electors of Norwich—wrongfully deprived of the franchise—did good service in this matter. They became guardians of the public morals,—thus setting a noble example, which may well shame those who refuse them the common rights of Englishmen. We are informed by the 'Norwich Mercury' of the 10th that it was 'the determination of the non-electors to keep watch and ward to prevent bribery.' This plan had been closely adhered to. For many nights patrols have been established. On Wednesday night, the patrols were largely increased, numbers of families, who never went to bed, were on the *qui vive*, and there was no place which did not undergo increasing vigilance until the business of the day commenced.

This was a noble work, and it was nobly done. Vast numbers walked the streets throughout the night preceding the election, 'watching the enemy, and preventing them from bribery.' Their own candidates were resolved, come what would, to adhere to the *purity principle*, and the people would not permit *their* return to be endangered by the corrupting influence of tory gold. The city was thus guarded from pollution, and both parties have come out of the contest free from the stains of former times. Such conduct is worthy of all praise. No terms can exaggerate its merit. It is an example held up before the citizens of this great empire, and preaches, with a voice not to be misunderstood, the omnipotence of the popular will, when enlightened by reflection and based on justice. It must have been with no ordinary satisfaction that Mr. Peto, at the close of the election, affirmed, 'I rejoice beyond expression to say, that not one shilling has been spent in contravention of the law. The election has been conducted on independence and purity of principle. The only force which has been used has been that of moral suasion, and the only impetus which has been given to your feelings, has been the determination that your own principles should be carried out.' This testimony is corroborated by a local journal, which, speaking of the election, says, 'Not one voter has been bribed, not one shilling has been spent in corruption. The election just won was the purest and most honest which ever occurred in this old city.' This is as it should be, and we shall be glad to find the example so worthily set in Norwich, closely imitated by other constituencies. Let candidates and electors making a religious profession, carry into politics the same integrity and single-mindedness as into other matters, and the grosser forms of corruption will be eschewed, and a higher tone of morals pervade every department of public life. We specially congratulate Mr. Peto, the senior member, on the result of the

now. They are happy matters of history, and what has recently taken place will help to prevent their recurrence. For the first time, probably,

contest, and on the means by which his success has been achieved. In an old constituency, long habituated to bribery, he has shown the possibility of achieving a popular triumph, without resorting to practices which the constitution condemns, and at which a Christian man should blush.

The return of Mr. Macaulay for Edinburgh is a circumstance not to be overlooked. We freely admit his great talents. It were mere folly to deny them. The splendor of his genius is unsurpassed, and his powers both as an orator and an historian are of the first order. His principles, moreover, are substantially those of the popular party. He is an onward man, who, in doing justice to the dead, is not unmindful of the living. We are, therefore, glad to see him once more in parliament, and are free to acknowledge that the mode of his return has been most flattering. Yet we could have wished, for the sake of Edinburgh itself, that some other place had had the honor of restoring him to the legislature. No change has passed, so far as we are informed, over Mr. Macaulay's views. They are the same now as they were in 1847; while the question which then lost him his seat is more prominent, possesses far more relative importance in 1852 than it did five years back. We are driven to the conviction that vanity has much to do with the choice of the self-styled 'Modern Athens.' But enough of this. May the historian of England, the man of whose genius we are proud, and on whose pages we love to ponder, prove equal to his situation. There is another feature of the Edinburgh election to which we must advert, though we cannot dwell upon it. The tactics of the free-church party were those of bitter and relentless hostility to the Lord Provost, a thorough reformer in politics, and a voluntary in religion. A more estimable man than Mr. M'Laren does not exist. His private worth is universally admitted, and his public principles—whether right or wrong—have been advocated without dogmatism or asperity. Yet against such a man the free-church party have resorted to the lowest, meanest, most scurrilous manœuvres. We envy not their triumph. Mr. Cowan has indeed been returned by a majority of 1754 to 1559, but in that majority are included 390 electors who split their votes between Mr. Cowan and the tory candidate. 'I have had the honour,' said the Lord Provost, 'of having had recorded in my favor the votes of 1,559 independent electors, not gathered together from all corners of the globe, but the very heart's blood of the liberal party. All of us are united as the friends of civil and religious liberty. We recognise no parties among us—neither the conservative party, nor the old whig party, nor the church party, nor the catholic party, nor the free-church party, nor any party but the citizens of Edinburgh, who wish to support me irrespective of any party combinations whatever.' The old whig party—and this has been the dominant one in Edinburgh—put forth its strength against Mr. M'Laren. We had hoped that this policy was abandoned. Its chiefs would do well to discountenance it, for anything more suicidal cannot be imagined. As to the free-church party, they may learn, when too late, the folly of the course they have taken. Of its *morale* we do not speak. This is needless. It has been a blunder for which they will yet pay dearly. A truce had existed between them and the voluntaries of Scotland. That truce they have broken, and they must



not, therefore, wonder if dissenters in principle refuse any longer to aid dissenters from mere circumstance.

We cannot close without adverting to the loss sustained by the liberal cause in the defeat of the late members for Bradford (York) and Cocker-mouth. Colonel Thompson was one of the first, as he has ever been one of the ablest and most consistent, advocates of free-trade. He is, moreover, an enlightened radical, and his integrity is above suspicion. At the close of the poll he was in a minority of six; and we have good reason to believe that this was caused by the Roman-Catholic electors, who thus sought to punish the votes he had given on *The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*. Up to two o'clock we are informed that the return of the Colonel was deemed certain, but the votes of Catholic electors, kept back till the last moment, turned the scale against him. What *they* will gain by the election of Mr. Wickham remains to be seen.

In the case of Cocker-mouth, General Wyndham, a ministerialist, has been substituted for Mr. Horsman. The bishops and their friends will rejoice in this, and we do not wonder at it; to us, however, it is matter of unfeigned regret. Mr. Horsman is not a Dissenter, nor did he ever do justice to our services. We have, therefore, no special cause for thankfulness to him. But he was an honest and fearless man, who hated wrong, especially when perpetrated in the name and under the garb of religion. He was, moreover, a pains-taking man, unappalled by labor, and undeterred by obloquy. It will not be easy to supply his place. He occupied a niche for which few were fitted, and that will probably remain void until he is restored to the House. A report reached us some time since that his defeat was mainly owing to the defection of the dissenters of Cocker-mouth; but having instituted inquiries on the point, we are able to give the report *an emphatic denial*. There is no truth in it, as we are assured on the best authority. The main cause of Mr. Horsman's defeat was the defective state of the registration.

We cannot dwell on the cases of Liverpool and Middlesex, as we had intended. The success of the ministerialists in the former instance prompted a resort to the same measures in the latter. Happily, the good sense and sound-heartedness of the men of Middlesex were proof against the artifice, and Mr. Osborne continues to represent the metropolitan county. The rampant bigotry and intolerance to which the conservatives appealed did their best, but the popular candidate was borne on to triumph by the zealous co-operation of all true reformers. We know no terms in which to express our loathing of the hypocrisy of the cry raised against Mr. Osborne; yet we should be wanting in frankness if we did not say that his electioneering speeches were much too personal for our taste, and that many of his reflections on the cant employed against him were capable of being wrested to a meaning foreign from his purpose. His cause was injured by these things, and we hope on future occasions that he will more obviously discriminate between the affectation of religion and religion itself. The terms he employed were, on many occasions, sufficiently large to cover the real as well as the counterfeit. He did not so mean it, but his opponents availed themselves of the opportunity to arouse prejudice against him.



## Literary Intelligence.

*Just Published.*

Brittanny and the Bible ; with Remarks on the French People and their Affairs. By J. Hope.

The Natural History of Creation. By T. Lindley Kemp, M.D.

Magnetical Investigations. By the Rev. W. Scoresby, D.D. Vol. II.

Falconry in the Valley of the Indus. By Richard T. Burton, Lieutenant Bombay Army.

Walks after Wild Flowers ; or, The Botany of the Bohereens. By Richard Dowden (Richard).

Reasons for Believing that the Lord has restored to the Church Apostles and Prophets. By a Clergyman.

Louisa, from the German of Voss.

The Journal of Sacred Literature. By Dr. Kitto, D.D. No. IV. July 1852.

A General Introduction to the Epistles of the New Testament ; with a Table of St. Paul's Travels. By a Bishop's Chaplain.

The Journal of Physical Regeneration. A Monthly Epitome of Public Health ; conducted by William Bayes, M.D. Nos. 1 to 6.

Wonders of Organic Life. Tyre ; its Rise, Glory, and Desolation. Religious Tract Society.

The Children of the Bible. Do.

A Book for the Sea Side. Do.

The Channel Islands ; Historical and Legendary Sketches. By C. J. Metcalf, Junior ; with Illustrations.

Heaven ; or, an Earnest and Scriptural Enquiry into the Abode of the Sainted Dead. By the Rev. H. Harbaugh, Pastor of the First German Reformed Church, Lancaster, P.A. 4th edition, revised and improved.

The Saints our Example. By the Author of ' Letters on Happiness.'

The Walk and Triumph of Faith, exemplified in the Life and Death of Ann Wright. By John Hayden.

Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy ; a Contradiction of the alleged Acts of Cruelty exercised by Miss Sellon, and a Refutation of certain Statements put forth in the Tracts of the Rev. Mr. Spurrell, Miss Campbell, and others, &c. By Commander Sellon, R.N.

Money and Morals ; a Book for the Times. By John Lalor.

The Tagus and the Tiber ; or, Notes of Travel in Portugal, Spain, and Italy in 1850—51. By Wm. Edward Baxter. 2 vols.

On the State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity. Part. III.

The Principles and Duties of Congregationalists. By Rev. John Harris, D.D.

Ecclesiography ; or, The Biblical Church Analytically Delineated. By John G. Manly.

Life of the Rev. William Kirby, M.A., F.R.S., &c., Rector of Barheen. By John Freeman, M.A.

The Child's In-Door Companion ; or, Stories for Rainy Days. By S. S. S.

The Textual Commentary on the Book of Psalms. By H. N. Champney.

Formation of Character ; a Book for Young Men ; being a Companion to Maidens and Mothers. By Rev. Thos. Binney.

The Illustrated London Geography. By Joseph Guy.

The Illustrated London Drawing-Book. Edited and arranged by Robert Scott Burns, M.S.A.